3938 aa 50

AN VNERRABLE CHURCH OR NONE

BEING A REJOYNDER TO THE UNERRING UNERRABLE CHVRCH

Against Dr Andrew Sall's Repley entituled The Catholic Apostolic Church of England.

Written by J. S. and dedicated to the most illustrious Prince, James Duke of Ormond, &c.

By

He presented to himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing. Ephes. 5. 27.

Ignatius ~~Fu Waddinge~~ Browne.

By.

'The Rw.ll

Anno 1678.

Ignatius Sec. Jesu. Brown.

BRITISH MUSEUM

AN ADVERTISEMENT TO THE READER.

AFter twelue full months that this Treatiſe leyes by, ready for the print, it comes to light; too *late* in the Authors opinion; better *late* than *never*, in the judgment of others; and ſom perhaps will ſay, *better never*; each one as he fancies; but the booke, which is a Debitor *Sapientibus* & *Inſipientibus*, to the *Wyſe* and *fooliſh*; goes neer hand to pleaſe both: to the *fooliſh* who would not have it come out; it's ſom ſatisfaction, that its come out ſo late; to the *Wyſe*, who ſo earneſtly deſired it, it's a ſatisfaction, that it comes out, tho later than they expected it. They who liked the former Treatiſe, probably will not miſlike this: the blind with ignorance or prejudice will like neither. As it has met with a *forreign* Printer who vnderſtands not the language, ſo it may vnluckily meet ſom *Homely* Reader who vnder-

ſtands not the ſenſe of it; the *Firſt* has been ſo ingenuous as to confeſs his *Erratas*, and give you a Catalogue of them in the end of the book; but I do much fear the ſecond will not be ſo humble, as to acknowledge his Ignorance: Pardon the firſt, and Pray for the ſecond.

TO THE MOST ILLUSTRIOUS PRINCE

James, Duke, Marques, and Earle of Ormond, Earle of Brecknock and Offery, Viſcount Thurles, Baron of Arklow, Lord of the Regalities and Liberties of the County Palatin of Tipperary; Chancellor of the Univerſities of Oxford and Dublin, Lord Lieutenant General, and General Governor of his Majeſties Kingdom of Ireland, Lord Lieutenant of the County of Sommerſet, the Citties of Bath and Wells, Lord heigh Steward of his Majeſties Houſhold, one of his Majeſties moſt honorable privy Council, of his Kingdoms of England, Scotland and Ireland, and Knight of the moſt noble order of the Garter.

AY it pleaſe your Grace;

The Catholic Religion has been twice charged with foul crimes and errors, before the

ſupream Tribunal of our Nation, in two diſtinct books, preſented by my Antagoniſt to his Excellency the Earle of Eſſex; It's juſt I put in my anſwer before the ſame Tribunal, which I humbly preſent to your Grace: and tho I may not expect a favorable doom for the cauſe I defend, from ſo vigorous a ſtickler of the Church of England, as your Grace has in all occaſions appeared; yet I may expect a check of the affront caſt by my Adverſarie upon your noble Predeceſſor the Earle of Eſſex, and upon your Grac's own Perſon; I accuſed him of impiety in having paſſed his ſentence of eternal damnation againſt his Mecœnas, the Earle of Eſſex's Anceſtors, who almoſt all dyed in the Roman Catholic Religion, in which, he ſaies, ther's no Salvation: in his Reply he denies that execrable Poſition to have dropt from his pen; but in the 2. Chap. of this Treatiſe I prove evidently it did, and that it follows vnauoidably out of his Principles; does not the Author of ſuch a Poſition deſerve your Grac's frown? And tho your generous contempt of the Envious of your glory, may forgiue him the injury he does to your own Perſon; but, may it pleaſe your Grace, you will permit vs to be deeply concern'd for the wrong of ſo eminent a perſon, who, by the general acclamation of our Realm, is the

Darling *of the* Commons, *the* Ornament *of our* Peers, *the* Cabinet *of our* Soveraign, *the* Oracle *of the* State, *and ſo prime a* Pillar *of the Proteſtant Church* (*worthie to be of a better.*) *One of the glories of your moſt illuſtrious Family, May it pleaſe your Grace, is to haue had in it a* Saint *of ſo incomparable a courage in the defence of Gods cauſe; of ſo vndaunted a conſtancy in perſecutions and adverſities, as* S. Thomas *Arch B ſhop of Canterbury, by ſurnam* Becket; *in whoſe kinred the* Butlers *of Ireland did euer yet religiouſly glorie; the world revered him as a moſt renowned Saint, which name he purchas'd with the price of his blood; My Adverſary blots your Grac's Scutchon, by effacing out of your family this glorious Saint; he was he ſaies, no* Real *Saint; he was but only a* Titular *one; your* Saints, *ſaies he,* are but Titular Saints, who purchas'd their Titles by public authority, as Earles and Lords do theirs *pag.* 228.

Nor is this the only injury he does your Grace; the world was perſuaded your Religion was Proteſtancy, *and nothing els but* Proteſtancy; *and I believe your Grace would eſteem it an affront, to ſay your Religion is* Quakerie *or* Presbitery; *but Dr. Sall is ſo kind to your Grace, as to giue it you*

in print; for he prefixes this Title to his 12. Chap. againſt N. N. The large extent of Chriſtian Religion profeſſed in the Church of England; *and there runs vpon all the Sects of the world*, Lutheraniſm, Presbitery, Hugonotiſm, *&c. and ſaies all are the Chriſtian Religion profeſſed in the Church of England. Your Grac's Religion is the Chriſtian Religion of the Church of England; and the Chriſtian Religion profeſſed in the Church of England, ſaies our Doctor, is* Presbitery, Quakerie Lutheraniſm *and all other Sects; conſider, may it pleaſe your Grace what a Religion my Adverſary gives you*, One *and the* Same *Religion with the* Quakers, Seekers, Mukhultonians. *No Proteſtant in England will deny he is* In, *and* Of *a Fallible Church; but no Proteſtant in England, I believe, will, acknowledge he is of a* Fals *Church, actually plung'd in horrid errors; but if the Religion of the Church of England be one and the ſame with all thoſe Chriſtian Sects, which profeſs contradictorily oppoſit Tenets, it muſt be a fals Church, and deeply plung'd in innumerable errors.*

May it pleaſe your grace, if the Proteſtant Church be ſuch as my Adverſary ſetts it foorth, I wiſh you out of it with all my ſoul; and becauſe I know its not much better, what

euer dreſs, he or any other may give it, Pardon me, May it pleaſe your Grace, that without any If *or* And *I wiſh you in that which is the only true and Saving Church; that as your Grace is the Beſt of ſubjects, you may be the beſt of Chriſtians, and for an earthly Tranſitorie Dukedom, which coms ſhort to your vnparallell'd Merits, you may enjoy an euerlaſting Diadem, which is the conſtant Prayer of,*

May it pleaſe Your Grace.

Your moſt Dutifull and
obedient Servant.
J. S.

15 MY 82

THE PREFACE.

THe plauſible outſide and faire cunning dreß of I. S. his diſcourſe in his Vnerring Vnerrable Church, ſaies our Dr in the firſt Page of his Repley, has put him to the trouble of ſearching into its hidden diſeaſes by *Inciſions* and *Diſſections* of *Anatomy*: he has ſpared vs this labor I thank him, the diſtemper of his diſcourſe appears ſo viſibly in its exterior parts that wee need no *Inciſions* or *diſſections* to lay it open: but ſince he has play'd the part of a Chirurgion, let him give me leaue to act that of a Phyſitian and preſent him a Doſs of Pills, which ſhall have nothing of bitterneſs, but what Truth carries with it to ill temper'd Pallats. Thoſe rude expreſſions, *Scurrilous*, *Impudent*, *Lyar*, *Impoſtor*, *Profligatly bold*, and ſuch flouriſhs (wherwith his book is thick ſet) become very well the cauſe he defends, which is of no better *Alloy*; yet it cannot but ſurpriſe me, to ſee him promiſe in his printed ſermon ſuch a gentle temper, challenging only to a ſober exchange of Scripture and

reaſon ; and in his late book I find him ſo peeuiſh and boyſterous, that he yields to none of his Reformed Writers in their acuſtomed ſtyle ; but Alas! he who broke thoſe ſacred tyes which he had to God and his Church; its not to be admired he infringes bonds of a ſmaler ſeyſe: I confeſs I am apt to believe this coyn is not of our Drs ſtamping ; nor yet of any ſchool man of that noble Univerſitie of *Oxford*, as ſom do imagin ; doubtleſs it muſt have bin fetcht from *Billingsgate* ; but our Dr is to be Blamed for permitting a book ſo filthily worded to be publiſht in his name, without any thing that might be a baite to the attention of an ingenious Reader, but injuries, tales of Popes, Fryars, parities of turnips, rotten apples, and Spaniſh Proverbs, ſaluting Modeſtie a far of in his 13. Page ; *Pardon me, o Sacred Laws of Modeſtie*, and this complement being made, he bids Modeſtie *A Dieu*, and no more news of it in all his booke, but rattles and ſcolds beyond meaſure without any thing that reliſhs a ſcholler, or an anſwer to his Antagoniſt ; but ſom little words heer and there (like few grains of corn in a

heape of chafe) without any connexion, or ſenſe, either to enervat his Adverſari's arguments or eſtabliſh his own Doctrin; that you would think it's ſom old book made to ſom other intent, and a new Title given it, for to make it an anſwer to his Adverſaries.

And this is the ſtrain of Proteſtant Writers, the vnhappineſs of their cauſe, and the goodneſs of ours being ſuch that they cannot better their own, nor worſe ours, but by paſſion in lieu of reaſon, and invectives and calumnies, inſteed of ſolid arguments; in which art the two late Champions which Ireland has given to the Church of England, Dr *Egan* and Dr *Sall*, do ſo excell, that none but the firſt could parallell the ſecond: and I cannot but admire the particular ſtudy which Dr *Sall* ſeems to make of tredding the footſteps of the other, as if he did ſtriue, to copy out his actions; Dr *Egan* caſt of his habit and became a Proteſtant; Dr *Sall* ſoon after did as much; Dr *Egan* goes to England to reape the benefit of his change in Religion; Dr *Sall* runs after him to do the like; Dr *Egan* preachs and prints his ſermon, Dr *Sall* muſt do no leſs; Dr *Egan*

takes the degree of *Bachiller* in the Univerſitie of *Oxford*; Dr *Sall* muſt have that of *Doctor* in the Colledge of Dublin; Dr *Egan* ſtyles himſelf *Confeſſor General* of Ireland; Dr Sall think's Iriſh Titles to be too mean, and fetchs them from Spain, *Lector of Moral Theologie in the Royal Colledge of Salamanca* &c. God bleſs the couple; its no ſmale glorie and comfort for the Church of England to have got them, and I wonder why they begin to be wearie of them.

But tho he be very bitter all along in his book, in no where does his iraſcible facultie appear ſo ſharpe edged as in the defence of his imaginary Titles of *Profeſſor of Divinity* in *Tudela* and *Palencia* in Spain; Lector of *Moral Divinity* in the Royal Colledge of *Salamanca*; *Profeſſor of Controverſies* in the Iriſh Colledge of *Salamanca*: He will prove me a *Lyar*, and a *Profligatly bold Impoſtor* for diſputing him theſe Titles; and how? marry by an Epigram made to his praiſe by a Prince; By *Teſtimonial Letters* of the great credit he had in Spain; by a *Letter* of a Venerable Prelat written in his commendation, and by a Lycence vnder the Inquiſitor General's hand for

to reade prohibited booKs, in quality of a Lector of Controverſies in the Iriſh Colledge. I beſeech you good Reader aſK him has he Kept the teſtimonial letters of his *Prieſtly Ordination*; it's a thouſand to one if he has not loſt them; but the teſtimonial letters of his great credit and empty Titles he has carefully preſeru'd. But that you may ſee how farr he is from proving me a *Lyar*, and a *Profligatly bold Impoſtor*; remember, I pray, what he advanced in his printed, Sermon and obſerve what his teſtimonial letters import.

In his Sermon he told vs he was *Profeſſor of Controverſies in the Iriſh Colledge and his Auditory were Spaniards, french and Iriſh*: will not any who reads this, and Knows not the Dr^s^ humor, conceive that this *Profeſſorſhip* of Controverſies was ſom public imployment, attended by ſo great an Auditory? I replyed there was no profeſſor of Controverſies in the Iriſh Colledge with Spaniſh and french Auditors; and this I do again auerr, and will prove it; for I do not deny but that either he, who is there in the office of *Rector*, or ſom other Ieſuit who lives with him, (commonly he is alone) has

the Title and name of *Lector* of Controverſies; but this is but an empty Title, (as the Duke of Lorrain is called *King of Ieruſalem*,) and never yet had any other exerciſe, but to teach half a douzen lads, Collegians of the Colledge; and this very ſlender exerciſe itſelf, it has it but very ſeldom; but never yet was it ſeen, or permitted that any extern Schollars either Spaniards, french, or Iriſh ſhould enter into the Colledge to be taught: as I write this I receive a letter from the Rector of the Iriſh Colledge of Salamanca, a Man of credit for his virtue and learning; he writes thus in anſwer to my letter. *Some time there has bin in this Colledge the Title of Profeſſor of Controverſies, but a meer Title without any exerciſe, becauſe the imploiment of that Perſon, was only to repaſs and expound to the youth of the Colledge, their Dictats, which they write in ſchoole; nor was it ever permitted that any extern ſchollar ſhould com into the Colledge to be taught, but only the Domeſtic Schollars of the houſe: ſomtimes perhaps, he that was in that imploiment did reade ſom leſſon out of Bellarmin or Becan, which Mr Sall might have don; but as for to have bin Profeſſor of*

Moral Divinity in the Royal Colledge of this town; ther's no ſuch thing; for there was never yet any Profeſſor of Moral Divinity in it: as for to be Lector of Divinity in Tudela and Palencia; in Tudela there never was any Divinity taught; but there is there a Maſter of Caſes of Conſcience, whoſe Auditory never exceeds the number of four or fiue, and commonly he has none: in Palencia ther's no Divinity taught that euer I could hear of. Thus goes the letter from the Iriſh Colledge of Salamanca, and you may ſee, that Dr Sall's cenſure againſt I S. of *Profligat boldeneſs* and a *Lyar*, has more of good Engliſh than of truth and common civility.

His teſtimonial letters of his great credit prove juſt nothing; for Example, a Prince forſooth made an Epigram in his praiſe; ſuppoſe that be true; what then? do not wee all know the priviledges of Poets and Painters? a Prelat baniſht, meets him in Pāplona in Spain, and expecting he might be of ſom ſervice or comfort vnto him in that ſtrange Country, he writes in his commendation, what he would have him write, and he thought might availe for to ſtop him there; what does all that amount vnto? That the Prelat was deſirous to

haue a friend and Country man in that Citty; and ſeeing him teaching Divinity, without any further examin believed him a brave man: His lycence vnder the Inquiſitor General's hand for reading heretical books as being Profeſſor of Controverſies; proves, at moſt, that he had that Title; but ſaies nothing of the exerciſe of it; which was no more but to be a *Pedagogue*, as wee have ſaid, to half a douzen Collegians, and ſaies nothing of the Spaniſh and french Auditorie: Our Dr tells vs there are *Several Ieſuits now living in Ireland, who were Students in Divinity, when he was a Profeſſor of Moral Theologie and Controverſies in Salamanca, who did ſee him ſit with the other Lectors of Divinity examining yearly their ſufficiency for promotion.* Never did man ſpeake leſs truth and with more courage; had not misfortune fruſtrated, or at leaſt delayed our hopes, of ſeeing that witty Treatiſe entituled *Haudkins Letters*, the product of an exquiſit judgment, and of a no leſs learned man; we ſhould have an exact and pleaſant account of the Dr's great imployment and credit in ſpain: but ſince he has cited ſom Jeſuits now living in Ire-

land for ſpectators of his glorie in Salamanca; I will declare what they depoſe, and I have that ſatisfaction of their truth and ſinceritie, that I am ſure they would not for any paſſion either impoſe vpon me, or diminiſh of any mans credit: two of them knew him in Salamanca, and ſo far from ſhoulder-ing with the Lectors of Divinity in the Royal Colledge, that his credit did not reach to be thought worthy, to carrie their bookes; never was he of ſo much credit as to be either invited or permitted to argue, as much as in their Domeſtic Theſes; never was there any Moral Divinitie taught in the Royal Colledge; nor Controverſies in the Iriſh Colledge but as we mentioned before; never was he a Coexaminator with the other Lectors of Divinitie, but in one occaſion, that ſome Lectors of Divinitie being abſent in the time of examen, they honored the Charge of Rector of the Iriſh Colledge which he had, by calling him to be one of the Examinators: and if of this little accidentarie ſubſtitution he be ſo full, as to reckon himſelf among the Examinators, and to cope with the Lectors of Divinitie of

that Royal Colledge; likly, if at any time, ſome one did conſult him in a caſe of Conſcience, when he was in Salamanca is all the ground he has, for to call himſelf, *Lector of Moral Theologie* in the Royal Colledge; and by this Rule, if he has heard any on's Confeſſion in ſpain, he might haue called himſelf *Confeſſor General of Spain* with as much reaſon as his friend *Egan* ſtiles himſelf *Confeſſor General of Ireland.*

But will you ſee how this man, who ſo mightily magnifies himſelf, ſpeakes of others; not well, to be ſure; for ſelf admirers, are ordinarily deſpiſers of others: in his 5. chap. he touchs that ridiculous Conſecration of his firſt Proteſtant Biſhops at the *Nags-head Tavern in Cheapſide*, and ſaies, it's a ſlanderous fable invented by Papiſts, long ſince refuted, and lately revived by a Perſon of a greate calling, to his ſhame and confuſion; being convicted of impoſtures by B. Bramhal: And dare you, Dr, to charge a Perſon of ſo great a calling with impoſtures? a Perſon of ſo knowen honor and reputation, with ſhame and confuſion? if, to have given ſignal teſtimonies of his Duty to his

exiled Soveraign in the moſt renowned Courts of the world; if, to have the whole Royal family for Panegyriſts of his Loyaltie and good ſervices, be a ſhame; you may accuſe him of it: if, to have had Rome and Portugal for admirers of his Wit and learning; if, to have given to the world many learned Treatiſes; if, to have been the only man named in the laſt proclamation for the baniſhment of Prelates and Regulars be a confuſion, and not a proof of his merit, that he was ſingl'd out, as the *David* of our Camp; if this be a confuſion, you may charge him with it: if to be honored and eſteemed by the beſt of Catholics and Proteſtants; and hated by none, but by the worſe of both, be a ſhame and confuſion; you may charge him with it: if to have been eſteemed and aplauded in the Communitie, wherof he was once a Member, and from which nothing, but an indiſpenſable neceſſitie of the Church, and King's ſervice could ſeparate him; which he no ſooner performed, and the Charge he now has, was offered him; but he religiouſly ſacrific'd that Eminent charge in the hands of the ſupe-

rior to God, earneſtly aſking to return to that Communitie; which was denied moſt prudently, becauſe it was knowen his Eminent Talents would ſhine with more luſte to the glorie of God, and benefit of the Church in that great imployment, than in a priuat life; if you call this a ſhame and confuſion, you may charge him with it; but to call his convincing diſcourſe of the Nullity of your Clergy, his ſhame and confuſion, and your B. Bramhal's weake Repley a conuiction of his impoſtures, is to betray your judgment, to be an injuſt balance of what is honorable, glorious, judicious and wittie.

And truly you have given no ſmale teſtimonie of this, in that great Title you give your Booke; *The Catholic Apoſtolic Church and faith of England*: as you hope to be ſaved, Dr, did not you laugh, when you were writing that Title; if the frights of a byaſs'd conſcience can permit you to laugh? when firſt I viewed it, and met in the Frontiſpice of the book, *The Theater of Oxford*, I thought it was a Comedy acted in that Univerſitie; but ſince that he will have it paſs for a ſerious diſcourſe

of Religion, wee muſt demonſtrat how ill qualified his Church is for to carrie ſo glorious à Title; and tho this has been ſufficiently evidenc't in my former Treatiſe, and my arguments in no wiſe anſwered; yet I will again ſo enforce the truth in this Rejoynder, that my impartial Reader will I hope be convinc't that the Roman Catholic Religion: is the true Catholic, Apoſtolic Religion; and that Chriſt has no Church on earth, if there be not an Unerring Unerrable Church, and as I, to ſhun a tedious repetition of what I formerly ſaid, do omit the ſtrong arguments of my former book, which convincingly prove the points heer handled; ſo I hope my Reader for to be fully ſatisfied, will not be content with reading this Treatiſe, but will alſo caſt an eye vpon the former: As neither paſſion nor prejudice has any ſhare in my intention, ſo I hope my Reader will lay both aſide in the peruſal of my endeavors, which aime at nothing but his ſpiritual advantage, as being

His friend in C. J.

J. S.

15 37 82

THE INTRODUCTION

CONTAINING SOM FEW Reflexions Upon the first Part of Doctor Sall's Book in answer to his Adversary N. N.

THE Doctor has deuided his Book into two Parts ; the first against N. N. the second against J. S. and tho I am directly concern'd in the second ; yet it might be vnkindly taken by my Reader , that I should let the first pass vntoucht. I do most profundly reuere the eminent pen of N. N and am sufficiently perswaded he wants not my concurrence for to answer Doctor Sall ; but I am no less convinced by the experience I haue of his ciuility , that he will pardon me , that I satisfy the public ex-

pectation (as I am inform'd) with this brief diſcours, whyle himſelf prepares a more acompliſht confutation of his Antagoniſt in a compleater work: for I do not intend an exact Anatomy of his whole diſcours; but ſom few reflexions vpon the chief heads of it; yet ſuch as will, I hope, ſufficiently refute his errors, diſcloſe his forgery and inſincerity, and help my Reader to a more perfect vnderſtanding of what I diſcours in my Book: therefore I premiſs theſe Reflexions by way of an Introduction to my Treatiſe.

In his 2. Chapt: againſt N. N. he pretends to proue the Church and faith of England to be *Catholic Apoſtolic*, and diſcourſes thus: *Whatever Church that faith is profeſſed in, vvhich vvas taught in the firſt called Catholic Apoſtolic Church; that Church and faith is trvly Catholic Apoſtoſtolic: In the Church of England that faith is taught and believed; becauſe, ſaies he, the faith taught in that ancient Church is contained in the Apoſtles Creed, and in thoſe of the four firſt General Councils, and the Church of England profeſſes and believes all the conte nts of thoſe creeds; therefore the Church and faith of England is truly Catho-*

lic Apoſtolic: for, ſaies he pag: 17. *if the contents of thoſe Creeds were ſufficient to gain the name of Catholic Apoſtolic to the Ancient Church, firſt ſo called; why ſhould not they be ſufficient to make a Church Catholic Apoſtolic in all other ages.*

The weakneſs of this diſcours is evidenc't by a cleer inſtance. In the Apoſtles dayes, when there was no creed but theirs, the faith then taught was the ſyſtem of Articles contained in that creed; the Church was then Catholic Apoſtolic by belieuing the contents of it; in what euer Church that Doctrin and faith was taught, that Church was truly Catholic Apoſtolic; but when in ſucceeding ages the four firſt General Councils delivered their Creeds and declared ſom Verities oppoſed by Heretics; to be reuealed Truths; then for to be a Catholic Apoſtolic Church, it was not ſufficient to belieue the contents of the Apoſtles Creed, but it was needfull to belieue the contents of the four Councils Creeds: Obſerve I pray Reader, that all Heretics will proue their own Church to be Catholic Apoſtolic by our Doctors diſcours, for (ſay the Arrians, Neſtorians and Pe-

lagians) wee belieue the contents of the Apoſtles creed, which alone, before any Council of Nice, Conſtantinople. &c. gained the name of Catholic Apoſtolic to the Church in the Apoſtles daies; and ſay they, *indeed it muſt appeur ſtrange* (they are your own wonds pag: 17.) *to any imparitial man that the ſyſtem of Articles contained in that Creed, vvhich gained the name of Catholic Apoſtolic to the Church, firſt ſo called in the Apoſtles dayes, ſhould not be ſufficient to make a Church Catholic in all times.* This is your argument, Doctor which the *Arrians*, *Pelagians*, and *Neſtoriãs* borrow from you to proue their Churchs and faiths to be Catholic and Apoſtolic, as well as yours: does it proue them to be ſuch, or not? if not; nor does it proue your Church to be Catholic Apoſtolic: you muſt anſwer them, as wee anſwer you; that in the Apoſtles daies vntill the four firſt General Councils, the ſyſtem of Articles contained in the Apoſtles Creed was ſufficient to give the name of Catholic Apoſtolic to the Church which belieued them; but when afterward the Church by its General Councils declared other Verities oppoſed by Heretics,

to be reuealed Truths; then for to gain the name of Catholic Apoſtolic Church, it was not ſufficient to belieue the contents of the Apoſtles Creed, but it was requiſit alſo to belieue thoſe Verities declared by the Councils to be reuealed Truths, tho not expreſſed in the Apoſtles Creed: euen ſo wee ſay to you; tho the Apoſtles and four firſt General Councils creeds were once ſufficient to giue the name of Catholic Apoſtolic; but after that new declarations were made of other Verities by ſucceeding Councils; for to gain the name of Catholic Apoſtolic, its not ſufficient to belieue the contents of thoſe Creeds but that wee muſt belleve all verities propoſed to vs by the Church in ſucceeding ages and Councils to be reuealed Truths: And this our Doctor cannot gainſay, for pag. 60. he confeſſes that Inferiour Verities are not contained in the Creeds; and yet are to be explicitly belieued whenever wee are aſcertained that they are reuealed Truths.

In the 8. Chapt. of the *Venerring Vnerrable* Church, and in the 9th. Chapt. of this Treatiſe I proue the Doctrin of

Proteſtancy (as condiſtinct from Catholiciſm) to be but meer *Probable* Doctrin; (Read I pray thoſe Chapters) but its evident that the Doctrin contained in thoſe Creeds, nor the Doctrin belieued by the Ancient Church, which gained it the name of *Catholic Apoſtolic*, is not *Probable* Doctrin; therefore its evident that the Proteſtant Doctrin, as condiſtinct from Catholeciſm, is neiher contained in thoſe Creeds nor was belieued by the Ancient Catholic Apoſtolic Church. The Ancient Church belieued S. Peter and his ſucceſſors ſupremacy, as I will proue in the 14. chap. of this Treatiſe; they believed the Canon of Scripture (whither this, or that; it matters not for the preſent) they believed the Sacrements) if two, or ſeaven I will not diſpute now) their *Matter*, *form*, and *effects*; you believe *Figuratiue Preſence*; *the Kings ſupremacy*; *Communion in both Kinds*; and not a ſyllable of all theſe in the Creeds; how can you then, affirm that all the Doctrin believed by the Ancient Church firſt called *Catholic Apoſtolic*, is contained in the Creeds?

In his 3.c.ther's nothing worth the taking notice of, but two groſs calumnies;

the one that Bellarmin l. 3. de Eccleſia. c. 20. (and that book has but 17 chapt) teachs, that to be a member of the Church, it's ſufficient to profeſs exteriourly, without any interiour Aſſent, the Popiſh Doctrin and ſupremacy : the ſecond is againſt two Popes, *Paul* the fourth, and *Pius* the fourth; that they ſhould haue offered to Queen *Elizabeth* to ratify the *Reformation*, if ſhe did own their Supremacy, and them to be the Authors of the Reformation : ſuch a ridiculous ſtory could neuer be better couched than in our Doctor's book. Yes ind eed ; the Pope would becom a Proteſtant to currie favor with Queen *Elizabeth* and make the Emperour, the Kings of Spain, and France, and all Catholic Princes his Enemies ? the Pope would becom a Proteſtant, for to get a Biſhopric, or Penſion from Queen Elizabeth (for this is all he could expect, if perhaps he did not expect to marrie her) and forfeit his Popedom; for à Pope who becoms an Heretic loſes his Dignitie and reuenews : and can it ſink into any mans brains but of Dr. Sall, that an Italian would make ſuch an exchange ?

His 4th. chap. has as little of ſubſtance as his 3d. ſom few fragments of Suarez his Doctrin, without any anſwer, but, *Hovv can Suarez make this out* &c. Suarez proues irreſiſtably that the Proteſtant faith, where with they belieue the contents of the Creeds, is no Divin faith for true Catholic Apoſtolic faith, muſt be an infallible undoubted Aſſent; Proteſtants can have no ſuch, wheras they haue no vndoubted infallible Motiue or ground to reſt their aſſent vpon, as I haue largely and conuincingly proued in the *Vnerring Vnerrable Church* and in the 10. chap. of this Treatiſe.

From the 5th. to his 12. chap. he rambles vpon the valid and legal Ordinatioe of his Proteſtant Clergy and will not allow that *Pageant* of the *Nags-ead* Conſecration; *a ridiculous forgery* he ſaies *inuented by Papiſts*: but before wee enter into a neerer inſpection of this matter, wee will premiſs two things; firſt; that for a true and valid Conſecration of a Bishop, beſids the *Form*, or words of Conſecration pronounced by the Ordainers; *Impoſition of true Biſhops hands* is requiſit eſſentially; and if this be wanting the Ordination is quite

Null; ſecondly it is requiſit to tell you the paſſage of the *Nags-head* Tavern; it was thus.

Queen *Elizabeth*, to maintain by ſacriledge the Royal Diadem, which by iniuſtice ſhe vſurped againſt the vndoubted Right of the family of the *Stuarts*; recalled the Reformation, which Queen *Mary* had baniſht from the land; and pereiving the *Prelatic* Portie of it, was the moſt vſefull for her ends; ſhe reſolued to have Biſhops, and named for that dignity, *Parker*, *Horn*, *Grindal* *Iewvel*, *Scory* and others: No Proteſtant Biſhops of Henry the VIII. and Edward the VI. were then aliue; that ſpurious Race of Prelacy hauing ended in *Ridley* and *Latimer*, executed in Queen Maries time for Hereſie and Treaſon: and our new elected Biſhops were *Non pluſt* for to be conſecrated; becauſe no Catholic Biſhop would vndertake it: their firſt addreſs was to *Richard Creagh*, Lord Primat of Armagh, then Priſoner in the Tower of London, offering him his releaſe if he did lay his hands on them; but he religiouſly preferred an innocent impriſonment to ſo criminal a liberty.

Then they addreſſed themſelues to B: *Landaff*, a Walſh B: who at their firſt on ſett, gave ſom marks of flexibility; but *Bonner* B: of London threatning to excommunicat him if he attempted any ſuch thing in his Dioceſs; he would not yield to their importunity; they lead him to the *Nags head* Tauern at *Cheapſide* in London, with a deſign to put him in a merry humor, and thereby to perſwade him: but they came ſhort of their expectation. *Scory*, a reſolut blade, nothing danted at this repuls, reſolued not to let ſlip a Biſhopric for want of Popiſh Ceremonies: *vvhat*, quoth he? *do they think vvee cannot be Bishops if vvee be not greas'd?* (alluding to the Chriſm, where with Biſhops are anoynted.) and commanding Parker and his Camerades to kneel, bid them; *Get vp lord Biſhorps of England*: and this was that famous Conſecration of the Nags-head Tauern in Cheapſide; without any other *Keyes* but thoſe of a *Tavern*, nor any Chriſm but à glaſs of Wine. This is no new ſtory, like that of Mr *Maſon's* forged Regiſters; Mr *Neale* a profeſſor of Divinity in the Univerſity of *Oxford*, who forfeited his chair for not taking the

Oath of ſupremacy, was an eye wittneſs of the whole Paſſage, and related it to ſeueral Biſhops: Bonner andother Catholic Biſhops then liuing related it to *Kelliſon*, *Perſons*, *Holywood*, *Champney*, *Reynolds*, *Harding*, *Stapleton*, and other Catholic Writers, who immediatly publiſht it in print and cryed out againſt the Nullity of *Parker* and his Aſſociats Ordination, as appears in their Books, and particularly in the *Nullity of the Proteſtant Church and Clergy*, writ by the Author of that moſt learned and ſolid Treatiſe *of Religion and gouernment*.

Now wee will demonſtrat that this paſſage is true, and no invention of Papiſts as our Doctor pretends; and that the Proteſtant Biſhops were not other wiſe ordained, than as is related. For wee may without offence, and ought to belieue thatParker, Horn, and their other Aſſociats, in their Ordination acted conformably to the *Lawes* and *Statuts* of the land; to the *Acts* of Parliament; to the Doctrin generally profeſſed by the Drs. of the Reformation; to their own Bible, and 39. Articles of England; is it a calumny, or is it vnlykly that they did? But in that

Ordination, tho ridiculous it be in itſelf, and you confeſs it to be, ther's nothing (the circumſtance of a Tavern excepted) but what is warranted poſitiuely, and conformable to all thoſe: obſerue Reader that if that Ordination was in a Tavern (which the Author of the *Nullity of the Proteſtant Clergy* convincingly proues) is not material for our preſent Controverſy; the Choking bit is not that; but if that Conſecration was performed without any impoſition of true Biſhops hands, only by virtue of the Queens letters Patents, and Election; and this I will proue by the Acts of Parliaments, by the Doctrin of the Church and State, by the Proteſtant Bible and by their 39. Articles of England.

That ther's no other *Prieſthood* in the law of Grace but *Baptiſm*; that all Chriſtians as well Women as Men are Prieſts and equally impower'd. For to adminiſter the Sacraments and to exerciſe Spiritual functions; this Doctrin I ſay ſprung vp with the Reformation, and was generally taught and practis'd by the *reformed Brethren*, grounded vpon that text of S. Peter 1. 2. *Chriſt made vs*

all a holy nation, a Royal Prieſthood, and Prieſts to his father. *Whoſoeuer is a Chriſtian*, ſayes Luther l. de capt. Babyl. *let him beliewe vvee are all equally Prieſts; that vvee haue all the ſame povver for to adminiſter the Sacraments.* Zuinglius, Peter Martir, and many other Reformed Writers, quoted by Brierly tract. 2. c. 2. ſec. 10. deliuer the ſame Doctrin: this Doctrin was commonly taught ad practis'd in King Henry the VIII. and Edward the VI. time; for tho Henry the VIII. was no Proteſtant, yet his paſſion againſt the Pope was ſo outragions, that he permitted this Doctrin to be preached and practis'd; and in his and King Edwards time, *Latimer*, *Ridley*, and *Barlovv* without any conſecration by impoſition of Biſhops hands, exercis'd the functions of Biſhops, and ſate in Parliament in that quality; and *Fox* in his Martirol pag. 1064. relates that when *Latimer* and *Ridly* were ſentenc'd to death, in Queen Mari's time; Doctor Brooks Biſhop of Gloceſter, who degraded them, declared they were degraded of their Prieſthood, and not of their Epiſcopacy, becauſe they had not been duly and truly conſecrated.

Nor was this the practice and Doctrin of the first Reformers only, but also of the whole Protestant Church, declared in their 39. Articles, which is the stress of the whole Protestant Religion, and the Creed of their Church: *Crammer* aud his Associats in kings Edwards time composed them; in the 25. Article they declare five of the Sacraments, (wherof *Holy Oder* is one) to be none, as hauing no visible sign, and consequently no imposition of hands, instituted by Christ for their administration: and in the 23. Article they deny any Caracter of Priesthood (and consequently of Episcopacy) but Baptism, and that the office of Priesthood is common to all Christians. But *Parker* and his Camerades newly consecrated Bishops by Virtue of the Queens Letters Patents and Election, iudging that *Crammer* had not sufficicienly declared the sufficiency of the Prince or Magistrats Election for Episcopal Consecration, and the vselessnes of imposition of Bishops hands, they assembled togither the year 1562. and set out a new Impression of the 39. Articles, and corrected the 25th. wording it thus: *Those*

fiue commonly called Sacraments, that is to ſay, Confiruiation, Pennance, Order, Matrimony and *Extrem-Vnction, are not to be counted Sacrements of the Ghoſpell, being ſuch as haue grouven partly of the corrupt followving of the Apoſtles; partly are but ſtates of life allovved in Scripture, but yet haue not the nature of Sacraments, as Baptiſm and thelords ſupper, for that they haue not any viſible ſign or Ceremonie (obſerue vvell) ordained by Chriſt.* You ſee that not only the firſt Reformers and Drs. of the Church of England, but that the firſt Proteſtant Bishops and 39. Articles or Creed of their Church declare that no viſible ſign or Ceremonie, conſequently no impoſition of Bishops hands was inſtituted by Chriſt, or is needfull for Epiſcopal Conſecration. It's alſo the Doctrin of their Reformed Bible; for *Parker, Horn, Ievvel* and the reſt, not contented to correct the 39. Articles, corrected alſo the Bible; theyſet out a new tranſlation of it that very year 1562. interpreting the word *Kirotonia* which S. Hierom and all Ancient Drs. interpreted *Impoſition of Hands*; they turn'd it, *Ordination by Election* to make good, that the Princes *Election*

was ſufficient without any Impoſition of Bishops hands; and this Interpretation held vntill King James his time, then the true letter was reſtored to the Bible and *Impoſition of hands* put in.

Now it remains wee ſhew that this *Ordination by Election* without any Impoſition of hands, is warranted by the laws of the Land and Acts of Parliament; which if wee do evidence, our Doctor is much to be blamed for ſaying that Ordination of *Parker* and his Camerades at the *Nags-head* Tavern was ridiculous, and incredible; for what can there be more Credible, than that *Parker* and his Aſſociats did, in their Ordination, conform themſelues to the Laws of the Kingdom, to the Doctrin of their Bible, Church and 39. Articles? and how can Dr Sall or any Proteſtant ſay, an Ordination that is conformable to all theſe, is *ridiculous*. But to the point: Bee pleaſed to reade the Stat. 8. Eliz. 1. its thus: *And by the ſame Act and Statut there is giuen to the Queen, her heirs &c full powuerand authority by Letters Patents vnder the great ſeal of England from time to time to aſsign, name and authoriſe ſuch Perſons or Perſon, as ſhe and they ſhall think*

think convenient and meet for to exerciſe vſe, occupy and execute vnder her Heighneſs all manner of Iuriſdictions, Priuileges, Preheminences and authority in any wiſe touching or concerning any Spiritual or Eccleſiaſtical power or Iuriſdiction within this Realm. You ſee by this Statut that the Queen might haue authoriſed *Scory Couerdale* or any privat Perſon or Perſons, for to ordain Bishops: why then do you ſay its incredible that theſe Blades, ſhould in virtue of the Queen's letters Patents only, haue conſecrated one an other?

But hear yet the Queens Commiſſion to ratify and confirm that which you call ridiculous Conſecration, diſpenſing with any defect in them or any of them in their *State, condition* and *faculty: Wee do ſupply by our Soueraign and Royal Authority, if any thing be, or ſhall be wanting in theſe things which yee are to do by our commands, either in your ſelues or any of you, or in your condition ſtate or faculty which by the ſtatuts of this our kingdom, or by the laws of the Church are required or neceſſary; the time and neceſsity of affairs exacting this.* And if you will know what *thing* was this which *was wanting* in the

Perſons commiſſioned by the Queen for to Conſecrat Parker; what *neceſsity of time and affairs obliged her to diſpenſe in theſe things*; reade *Holywood de inueſtiganda Chriſti Eccleſia*, and you will be ſatisfied; he relates that Dr *Alabaſter* aſkt Mr *Brancroft* B. of London in the beginning of King James his raign how his firſt Proteſtant Bishop *Parker* was ordained and by whom? *Brancroft* anſwered, *I hope in caſe of Neceſsity a Prieſt may be ſufficient for to ordain a Biſhop*; granting tacitely thereby, that *Parkers* Conſecrators were no Bishops but Prieſts; and there was a neceſſity as the Queen herſelf confeſſes of making vſe of a Prieſt for ordaining; becauſe there was no Bishop who would conſecrat him: by this you may ſee what was wanting in the ſtate and condition of *Parkers* Conſecrators, and what was the neceſſity of time and affairs which forced the Queen to diſpenſe with them. And becauſe that immediatly after this conſecration of Parker and his Companions in the *Nags-head* Tavern, ſom exclaimed againſt the Validity of it, becauſe it was ſdon without Bishops, the Queen for to ſylence all ſuch exceptions, and allay

all doubts, declares in the ſame Statut.

And further for to auoid all ambiguities and queſtions that might be obiected againſt the lawfull conſecrations, inueſtings, and Confirmations of ſaid ArchBiſhops and Biſhops (that's to ſay *Parker* and his fellows) *her heighneſs in her Letters Patents vnder the great ſeale of England directed to any ArchBiſhop, Biſhop, or others* (obſerue the word *Others*, that's to ſay neither ArchBishop nor Bishop) *for the conſecration, inueſting, and confirming of any Perſon elected to the office or dignity of ArchBishop or Bishop, hath not only vſed ſuch words and ſentences, as are acuſtomed to be vſed by king Henry and Edward, her Maieſties father and Brother, in their like letter Patents made for ſuch cauſes; but alſo hath vſed and put in her Majeſti's letters Patents many other words and clauſes wherby her Majeſtie by her ſupream Authority hath diſpenſed with all cauſes, doubts, or any imperfection or deſability that can or in any way may be obiected againſt the ſame, as by her Maieſties letter Patents remaining of Record more plainly may be ſeen.*

Lay prejudice aſyde, *& quando animoſitatem qua teneris Viceris, tunc Veritatem poteris tenere, qua vincaris*; S. Aguſt.

l. 6. cont. Jul. c. 2. lay ſaies the ſaint vnto you, that animoſitie and prejudice aſide which poſſeſſes you, and you will poſſeſs the Truth, which is Victorious againſt you; for if paſſion does not pinfold your reaſon you cannot but ſee in theſe Statuts; firſt that the Parliament profeſſes a power in the Queen for to *authoriſe* not only ArchBishops and Bishops, but *Others*, who are neither, for to *Conſecrat Ordain* and *inueſt Bishops*; ſecondly you ſee the Queen in her commiſſion did diſpenſe in the inability and incapacity of the *Conſecrators* by her ſupream Power; which incapacity the Commiſſion ſaies was in their *ſtate* and *condition*: can it be denied but that they were by their *State* and *condition inable* and *incapable*? and wherefore? but becauſe they were not Bishops;

Againſt ſuch cleer evidences of the Nullity of your firſt Proteſtant Bishops Ordination; and of the truth of the Nags-head ſtory, our Dr Brings nothing, tho he keeps a great buſtle in many Pages, but Mr *Francis Maſons* Records, which relate the place time, circumſtances, and names of the Conſecrators of *Parker*, who were *Barlow Hod-*

kings, *Scory* and *Couerdale*, who by *Impoſition of hands* ordained *Parker* in *Lambeth Chappel*: but to ſay nothing, if thoſe Conſecrators were themſelues true Biſhops, I will ſhew that thoſe *Maſonian* Regiſters are forged, and as fals, as their Prelatic Ordination is Null: for, Parker's Ordination was the year 1559. as thoſe Regiſters do relate; not only Mr *Neale*; an eye witneſs of that paſſage exclaimed againſt the Nullity of it, but Bishop *Bonner* ad many other Catholics both of our Clergy and layetie; whervpon thoſe Statuts of Parliament were made to ſilence them, *Harding Champney Fitſimons*, *Holywood* and other Writers, printing againſt it, challenged *Parker* and *Iewel* to name the place and Perſons by whom they were ordained; *Wee ſay to you Mr Iewel* (ſaies Harding in Confut. Apol. printed an. 1566. *and to each of your Companions, ſhew vs the Regiſter of your Bishops; ſhew vt the letters of your Orders; but Orders; you haue not; for who could giue you that, of all your new Miniſters, which themſelues had not* This was the challenge; this was the clamor of our Authors; thus they preſſed thoſe new mock Bishops *Parker* and his Came-

rades to name their Ordainers; that their Ordainers were no Bishops, and consequently could make none: If any such as *Masons* Registers were then extant, relating the Pomp of Ceremonies, the concurs of Nobility at *Lambeth* Consecration, why were not those Registers produced then? was there any thing more obuions than to produce them, and by them, sylence, and confound our Writers, and assert the credit of the Protestant Church, which stood at the stake? But not a word did *Parker*, *Iewel*, *Horn* or any other Protestant Writer speake of those post-dated, enchanted Records; nor did ever any Catholic hear of them, vntill the year 1613. that is 54. years after Parkers Consecration: do not these Registers think you, smell strongly of forgerie?

Our Dr tells vs, that in all prudence wee are to rely, as to matter of fact, vpon the public Records of the kingdom; its very true Dr, when the Records are not justly suspected, and carrie, such visible marks of forgerie. But good Dr, stand to that Principle, that, *as to matter of fact wee are to rely on the public Records of the kingdom.* And which

do you judge to be the moſt authentic and public Record? *Maſon's* Regiſters, which, as they lay hid for 54. years (if any there were) in a privat mans hands; ſo they might haue been eaſily corrupted ad changed? or the *Statuts* and *Acts* of Parliament, which are kept with the care and vigilancy wee all know from corruption? ther's no man of common ſenſe but will rely with more ſatisfaction vpon theſe ſecond: ſee then what *Maſons* Records ſay; *that Parker was conſecrated by true Biſhops:* and what ſay the Statuts of Parliament? *that his Conſecrators were defective, inable, and incapable by their ſtate, condition and faculty, for to ordain.* Maſons Record import *that the Conſecrators needed no diſpenſation from the Queen, for to conſecrat Parker, becauſe he was ordained by true Biſhops:* the Acts of Parliament import that *they did need a diſpenſation; and that tho Queen did diſpenſe with them in their State and Condition.* Which of theſe two will you belieue, *Maſons* Records, or the Statuts of Parliament?

Our Dr ſaies theſe Records were ſhewen to divers of our Churchmen the year 1614. yes; but why not the year

1600. and the other years vpwards vn till Parkers Ordination, when they were ſo earneſtly called for by our Writers? becauſe they were not then hatcht: he ſaies thoſe Churchmen, after hauing peruſed and examined thoſe Records, judged them to be true; and what then? that proues not the truth of your Regiſters, but their ſincerity; for men of ſincerity and honor are ſlow in belieuing ſuch a horrid forgery, vntill they ſee good proofs for it: and tho they had judged them to be true, what doth their opinion ſignify, who liued 54. years after, againſt the teſtimony of Mr Neale who was an eye witneſs of the paſſage; againſt the teſtimony of B. Bonner who liued then, and in London; againſt the teſtimony of ſo many illuſtrious Writers, who immediatly writ againſt it, challenged to produce their Records and letters of their Otders, and were neuer anſwered? you know it's a ſacriledge to reordain a Prieſt or Bishop duly conſecrated; you know alſo it's our practice to ordain ſuch of your Miniſters as are converted, and will be Prieſted; and would B. *Bonner*, would Mr *Neale*, Har-

ding; *Kelliſſon Fitsſimons* and the reſt of our Catholic Prelats, and Authors, who liued in *Parkers* time, and ſuffered ſo much for their Religion and conſcience, induce the whole Church, by misinformation and impoſtures to ordain your Miniſters converted had they not aſſurance that your Parker and Aſſociats Ordination was Null and ridiculous.

Nor are wee Roman Catholics only who pleade againſt this Nullity: Remember that in the long Parliament, the Bishops were excluded out of the houſe of Lords; and an Independant Lord made a ſpeech to proue that excluſion to be juſt, becauſe the Proteſtant Bishops were no true Bishops for want of Ordination. Remember the *Puritans* reproach againſt your Church, that *the profane Order and conſecration of Proteſtant Biſhops had its beginning in a corner:* Do they allude think you to the Chappel of *Lambeth*. or to the *Nags-head* Tavern? looke with an impartial eye vpon this whole diſcours, and if paſſion does not prodigiouſly blind you, you will confeſs, the Nags-head ſtory to be no more ridiculous than true; your

Conſecration to haue been withont *any impoſition of hands* ; and conſequently Null ; and wheras all your Prelats deriue their *caracter* from *Parker* and his Aſſociats, your Clergy is but a Mockery, and your Bishops but laymen with Rockets.

But our Dr is reſolved to be quits with vs, ſince that wee have made his Bishops *Leymen*, he will not reſt till he dethrones our Popes : Not one true Pope does he grant vs ſince Gregorie the XIII. The Elections of all the ſubſequent were quite Null : this is a rare and new diſcouerie : but he ſaies it's not new ; for he ſaies it was made long ſince by a learned pen, à Roman Catholic, (he does not name him) who preſented à book to king James, and by him to the reſt of the Chriſtian Princes, ſhewing the neceſſity of gathering a Council againſt Paul the V. the Nullity of whoſe Election, and of hisPredeceſſors he pretends to proue ; and our Dr makes it a convincing argument of the ſtrength and truth ofthis book, that it was never anſwered by any of our Church ; and Ithink its rather a concluding argument of the *Nonſenſe* and

frivolouſneſs of the book (if any ſuch book was) that no Catholic Author did think it worth his labour to anſwer it: and if that book did make out, or with any appeerance of reaſon did ſhew the Nullity of the Elections of thoſes Popes, and particularly of Paul the V. then living, I know none to whom it would be more wellcom than to ſom ambitious Cardinal, who in hopes of getting the *Tiara* for himſelf would patronize and publish it: But when, notwithſtanding the many enemies the Popes haue in England, to advance any thing that might be to his deſadvantage, wee ſee, that that book was in its firſt birth ſo little applauded, that it never deſerued to peep out of England, for ought wee know; that it neuer deſerued any anſwer from Catholics, nor yet to haue been in any great Vogue among Proteſtants; this indeed is ſufficient to perſwade vs, that the book, if any ſuch has been, had as little of ſubſtance, as the author of it had of wit and Religion.

For was the man in his Wits, or what an opinion did he expect could the world haue of his Religion, who went

to a Ptoteſtant king for to haue a Council conuen'd againſt the Pope ? could it ſink into his brains, if he had any, that a Proteſtant Prince could be ſo fit an inſtrument for that vndertaking; as the Emperour, the kings of France and Spain, or ſom Catholic Monarch ? This is the Book, and this book and Author is the warrant our Dr giues you for all the clutter he keeps in many leaues he ſpends in prouing the Nullity, forſooth, of our Popes; and if the book itſelf deſerued no anſwer, much leſs do the fragments of it copied out by Dr Sall deſerue any.

To his 12th. Chap. he prefixes this Title; *The Vaſt extent of Chriſtian Religion Profeſſed in the Church of England*; and in four long Chapters he runs vpon the Sects in England, Holland France, Poland, Ruſſia, and what part not of Europe; nay he reckons vp all the Schiſmatic's of *Greece*, and all theſe he ſaies, are *of the Religion profeſſed in the Church of England.* And is not the Religion of the Church of England a monſtruous Body that is compoſed of ſo many members, and ſo deformed ? be a Preſ-

biteran be a Lutheran, be a Quaker, be a Seeker, be what you will, ſo you be not a Roman Catholic; you are of the Religion of the Church of England. Reade I pray the firſt Chapter of this Treatiſe where I proue out of the Drs. own Conceſſions that theſe Sects are Hereſies; reade alſo the 8. Chap. of my former Treatiſe of the *Vnerring Vnerrable Church*, where I convincingly proued that ſince the Roman Catholic faith is a true ſaving faith, as the Church of England confeſſes; and that there is but one ſaving faith as S. Paul ſaies; any Church or faith which differs from her in any Article or Doctrin, euen thoſe which yee call *Inferior Truths*, muſt be an Heretical and heterodox Church and faith, which if you had well read, Dr, and vnderſtood well, you would not haue troubledvs again with this ridiculous Doctrin, *of ſaluation in any Chriſtian Society*; or you ſhould haue been ſo juſt to your Adverſary as to anſwer to his diſcours vpon that ſubject; but I ſee you deſignedly ſtep aſide wheneuer you find yourſelf *Nonpluſt.*

When I read this Paradox of our

Dr I jndged the Catholic and Proteſtant Church to be perfectedly repreſented in the two Women conteſting about the living Child before *Salomon*; ſhee who was the true Mother would not haue the Child devided, but to live entire and vndeuided; ſhee who was not the true Mother would haue him devided and ſhared betwixt both: *Salomon* adjudged the Child to her who would not conſent to that inhuman diviſion; ſhe was the true Mother: This is our caſe; the Controverſy is, which is the true Religion and faith; the Catholic Church cannot endure to hear of any diviſion of the Church and faith of Chriſt into many oppoſit Sects; ſhe will haue but one Congregation vnanimouſly profeſſing One Doctrin, One Lyturgy, Rites and Ceremonies; The Proteſtant Church by the mouth of Dr Sall, and other Writers cry out, *Dividatur Infans; neither yee Catholics alone, nor wee Proteſtants only, nor any Congregation ſeparatly from the other, is the Church and faith of Chriſt; each muſt haue a ſhare; the faith of Chriſt is deuided betwixt vs*: Is not the Catholic Church think you to be judged the true Mother of

the faithfull, which deteſts this Barbarous diviſion of the faith of Chriſt into ſo many Sects? and are not Sectaries to be eſteemed Tyrants, who rent and teare it into ſo many peeces?

But I cannot omit a notorious calumny of our Dr. in his 12. chapt. where magnifying the great power and extent of his Proteſtant Religion in ſeueral kingdoms, he coms to ſpeak of *France*; *In France ſaies he, thoſe of the Religion haue* 70 *towns with Garriſons of ſoldiers gouerned by Nobles and Gentlemen of the Proteſtant Religion: they haue* 800 *Miniſters who retain Penſion out of the public Finance and are ſo diſperſed throughout the kingdom, that in the Principalites of Orange and Poitou, allmoſt all the inhabitants; a in Gaſcony the one half; in Languedoc Normandy and the Weſtern Prouinces a ſtrong party profeſſes the Proteſtant Religion; beſides the Caſtles and forts belonging to the Duke of Bullon, Count of Naual, Duke of Trimoulle Monſiour de Chaſtillon, Mareſhal de Diguiers, Duke de Sully and others.* When I read this peece of *Romance* in our Drs. book I turned preſently to the frontiſpice of it, to ſee in what year it was printed, for I ſuſpected it might haue

been in king Henry the fourth's time; when indeed the Hugonots were powerfull; but finding it was printed the year 1676. I admired the Auhors Boldneſs, and inſincerity in beguiling his Reader.

For not one town, garriſon, fort, or Caſtle, haue the Hugonots in France this day; not one Miniſter which retains Penſion out of the *Finance* but liues by the gratuity and alms of their Flock, as our Clergy in Ireland: It is true the Hugonots are more numerous in the Prouince of Poitou, than in any other in France, but to ſay, that almoſt all the Inhabitans are Hugonots; its agreat impoſture: I declare what I ſee, and what I hear from french men as well Catholics as Hugonots, that there is not one Hugonot for a hundred Catholics in that Prouince; about *Nyort*, *S. Maixance*, *Fontenée*, *Lucinian*, and all along from Poitiers to Rochel, the moſt part of the Gentry who liue in the Country are Hugonots; but of the common People and the Inhabitants of the towns, the Catholics are incomparably more numerous: The Dukes of Bullon, Rouan, Trimoulle &c. which

which he reckons as Hugonots, are all Roman Catholics ; nay for our Drs. comfort, let him know, that there is not one, of the Prime families of France this day a Hugonot exceptone, that's the *Count de Rußie*, a Cadet of the houſe of *Rochfoucaut* : Of the Nobility of the ſecond rank, there are ſom ; neither is there any Hugonot this day in France of any Vogue, either in the Court, Army, or civil government except Mareſhal de *Zumbert*, who is no French man. By this you may judge what little credit our Dr deſerues in what he tells vs of the vaſt power, and extent of his Brethren Sectaries in Poland, Tranſiluania Ruſſia &c.

He moſt groſly abuſes his Reader in telling him the Greek Church agrees with Proteſtants in oppoſing Tranſubſtantiation Purgatory &c. againſt Rome ; for in Luthers time, when *Ieremy* the Patriark of Conſtantinople vnderſtood that Luther boaſted, his Doctrin was profeſſed by the Greek Church; the ſaid Patriark aſſembled a Council of the Greek Prelats, and ſolemnly proteſted againſt, and condemned Luthers Errors ; declared they belieued Tran-

ſubſtantiation; Purgatory; Prayers to Saints &c. as Rome did: and the Acts and Decrees of this Council were printed and publisht by the Patriark himſelf, whoſe book is extant in many Libraries in France, and elſwhere: and about ten years agon by occaſion of a diſpute betwixt Monſieur *Arnaud*, and Monſieur *Claude* a Hugonot Miniſter; the Miniſter obſtinatly auerring, that the Greek Church and other Schiſmatics in the Turkiſh Dominions denyed Tranſubſtantiation and other Catholic Tenets; Monſieur *Arnaud* procured by means of the french Embaſſador in Conſtantinople an authentic public Declaration from the Patriark and Prelats of the Greek Church and other Schiſmatics, declaring Vnanimouſly their belief of Tranſubſtantiation and other Tenets of the Church of Rome, which Declaration is common in France, to be read in Monſieur Arnaud's booke *De la Perpetuité de la Foy &c.* ſo that tho the Grecians be Schiſmatics, its apparent their Doctrin of Tranſubſtantiation Purgatory and other Tenets controverted betwixt vs and Proteſtants, is the ſame with that of Rome.

From his 16th. Chap. to the end of his firſt part he has nothing worthy of any Reflexion but a diſcourſe of Tranſubſtantiation, which wee will examin in our 15. and 16. Chapt. He runs much vpon the vnlawfullneſs of Subjects raiſing Armes againſt their Prince; and I wiſh he could print this Doctrin deeply in his fellow Sectaries hearts; but he will not perſwade them ſo important a truth (as I will proue in the 11 Chapt. vntill the Church of England giues her Profeſſors an other Rule of faith, and not Scripture arbitrarily interpreted, belieued and practis'd as each one vnderſtands it, without any ſubmiſſion to a ſupream Paſtor from whom wee muſt receiue the true ſenſe of it. Now it's time wee examin his diſcours againſt J. S.

CHAPTER I.

A SVRVEY OF THE DOCTORS Dedicatory to the Earle of Eſſex; Sectari's Diſſention in faith, The Reformers, Reformation and Reformed Brethren briefly deſcribed.

ALL Chriſtian Sects, ſaies our Doctor to his Mecænas are joyned with the Church of England; they haue all but one and the ſame faith; and that faith profeſſed by that louely Company is the Primitive Catholic Apoſtolic faith; they differ ſaies he Chap. 12. againſt N. N. only in Rites and Ceremonies; and there is not one of theſe Sects but is as different from the other, and exclaim againſt one an other as much as againſt Popery:

aſk the Presbiterians what they think of Proteſtancie ? they ſay , its Popery in English ; aſk the Quakers their opinion of them both ? they are Limbs of Satan : aſk the Anabaptiſts what they judge of all three ? they are Children of Perdition.

But I pray Dr what is the faith of the Church of England as to the Canon of Scripture ? it belieues S Pauls Epiſtle to the Hebrews , the Epiſtles of Iames and Jude , the ſecond and third of S. John , and the 2. of S. Peter to be true Canonical Scripture ; and what is the Lutherans of Germani's faith as to this point ? that they are not Canonical : and is this difference but in Rites and Ceremonies ? does not the Proteſtant Church belieue the Adoration of the conſecrated Hoſt , and the vſe and prayers before Images to be downright Idolatry ; and Lutherans ſay its not ? and do you make but a Ceremony of Idolatry ? does not the Proteſtant Church belieue the firgurative only Preſence of Chriſt's Body in the Sacrament ; and the Lutherans belieue the Real preſence , which you ſay is an Error inconſiſtent with Salvation ? and

is this but a Ceremonie ? or will God condemn men for a meer Ceremonie ? does not the Church of England belieue the Neceſſity of both kinds in the Communion , and the Hugonots of France in their Eccleſiaſtical Diſciplin ch. 12. art. 7. deny it , and ſay it may for juſt reaſons be giuen in bread alone ? This is no Ceremonial difference betwixt your Church and ours ; for its, you ſay , one of our Errors inconſiſtent with ſaluation ; and why it ſhould be a Ceremonial buſineſs betwixt Proteſtants and Hugonots I know not : Nor are the Proteſtant Bishops of England ſo prodigal of their Eccleſiaſtical reuenews as to ſay that *Epiſcopacy* is but a Ceremony which they belieue to be de *Iure Divino* and the Presbiterians deny it : ſee you Reader with what appearance of truth our Dr can ſay that the Church of England and the other Sects are joyned in one faith.

O ! but , ſaies he ch. 12. againſt N. N. they all agree in the chief heads and fundamental points of Chriſtianity ; and what be they ? Bleſſed be God , that inſpired to our good Dr to tell vs what be thoſe fundamental points and chief

Articles wherin Proteſtant Writers do ſo often tell vs that all muſt agree for to haue true faith; and that all other points are but inferior Truths, Rites and Ceremonies: Our Dr then tells vs the chief heads aud fundamental points of Chriſtianity neceſſary to Salvarion; The Holy Scripture; the ſacred Trinity, the Perſon of the Son of God, God and man; The Providence of God, ſin, free will, the Law, the Ghoſpell, Juſtification by Chriſt; faith in his name; Regeneration; The Catholic Church, and ſupream head of it, Chriſt; The Sacraments, their number and vſe; The ſtate of Souls after death; the Reſurrection and life Etetnal; theſe are the chief heads and Subſtantial points and in theſe all the Reformed Churchs agree with that of England, ſaies our Dr in that 12. Chapt. againſt N. N.

But my Reader will not I hope be ſo eaſily perſwaded of this aggreement betwixt theſe Sectaries, euen in theſe Chief heads and fundamental points: for the Proteſtants belieue S. Pauls Epiſtle to the Hebrews and the other Epiſtles mentioned but now, to be Canonical Scripture; the Lutherans vtterly

deny them: The Lutherans in the Conference of Lypſia, the Magdeburgenſes, and the Lutheran Divins in the Conference of *Ratisbon* belieue Seauen Sacraments; nor do they agree in the *vſe of the Sacraments* for the Hugonots of France as I obſerved, belieue the Lords ſupper may be taken in one kind, the Church of England belieues it muſt neceſſarily be taken in both; in their Doctrin of Gods Providence they are all alſo far aſunder; for not only the Gomariſts in Holland following the Doctrin of Calvin, but alſo many Hugonot Churchs in France belieue that antecedently to any good or bad work of man, God has created and abſolutly Decreed ſom men to be eternally damn'd and others to be ſaved; the Church of England, the Arminians in Holland and many Hugonots of France deny this cruel decree in God, and belieue none is damn'ed by Gods abſolut Will and decree, but for his ſins. You ſee Reader how the Church of England and other Sectaries are at ears not only in Rites and Ceremonies; not only in Inferior and not Fundamental Articles, but euen in thoſe which our

Dr himself calls the chief points, and Fundamental Heads of Christianity: How can our Dr say they are all joyned in one faith? or how can he say the faith professed in the Church of England and in the other Sects is the Catholic Apostolic faith; if he will not say that one Apostle taught and belieued two Sacraments as the Protestants do; and an other Apostle Seaven Sacraments as the Lutherans of Lypsia and Ratisbon did; one Apostle taught that such Epistles were Canonical Scripture; and an other belieued they were not.

But Dr do not you confess that the Church of England differs from Lutherans, Presbiterians and other Sects in inferior and not Fundamental Verities? and no true Protestant of England who vnderstands well his Catechism will say that Protestants and Catholics differ in more than in Inferior Verities; what greater Vnion then can you pretend with Lutherans and other Sectaries than with vs Catholics? moreouer Doctor you say that errors against these inferior Verities are inconsistent with salvation if ignorance does not excuse

them; your Brethren Sectaries therefore will be as Deep in hell as Catholics, Becauſe they hold errors againſt your Inferior Verities as well as Catholics; and if they haue ignorance it muſt be *groſs*, *Willfull* and *obſtinatly blind*, as that of Papiſts becauſe they haue the Scripture which you ſay, plainly declares your Doctrin to any that is not *will fully and obſtinatly blind*: laſtly Dr you ſay in your Dedicatory that *the true nature of Hereſy conſiſts in Doctrin oppoſit to Scripture*: but all the Doctrin that Lutherans, Preſbiterians &c. hold in oppoſition to your Doctrin of England, is quite and plainly oppoſit to Scripture; becauſe you tell vs a thouſand times ouer both in your Sermon, and in your Book that your Doctrin of Proteſtancy, figurative Preſence, Communion in both kinds two Sacraments &c. is plainly ſetdown, and ſeen in Scripture to any that is not *willfully blind*; therefore the reſt of Sectaries, (who deny your inferior Verities) faith and Religion is plain Hereſy: behold Reader the faith and Religion wherin the Church of England and the reſt of Sectaries are joyned.

Our Dr goes on in his Dedicatory

Epiſtle, and tells his Mecænas that the Proteſtant Curhch and other Sectaries are Reformed Churches; that the faith of the Church of Rome was once praiſed throughout the World; its his and the Reformed Churches wiſh, he ſaies, that wee may return to our primitive luſtre and joyn hart and hand with them to the edification and encreaſe of Chriſtianity; But they being ſo ſeparated and diuided in Doctrin among themſelues as wee haue ſhowen; its impoſſible for vs to joyn with them vntill they agree among themſelues, and tell vs with which of them ſhall wee joyn; for with whatever Sect of them wee joyn, wee ſhall haue all the reſt on our backs, and ſo neuer be at reſt: the Preſbiterians will neuer conſent that wee joyn with Proteſtants; nor the Proteſtants will neuer condeſcend that wee ioyn with Lutherans; and ſo Dr Sall's Wiſh that wee joyn with the Reformed Churches is ridiculous.

Nor is it leſs ridiculous to call his Sects *Reformed Churches*. Obſerve Reader who be thoſe they call *Reformers*; who be they, that are called Reformed Brethren, and what is that they call

Reformation; and you will confeſs no Names were euer more abuſed. As for the firſt and Chief Reformers, the Author of that learned Treatiſe of Religion and Gouerument, in his firſt book, and N. N. in his Dolefull fall of Andrew Sall giues you an exact deſcription of them; Dr Sall very wiſely declins their vindication from the wicked life N. N. ſaies they lead; for he ſaies the Reformation may be very good in itſelf, tho Luther and ſom other Reformers were naught; as in the Apoſtolical Colledge, ſaies he there was a Judas; it's very true Dr, but if all the Apoſtolical Colledge was but a pack of *Iudaſes*, and not one honeſt man among them; could any man in his wits be perſuaded to belieue their Doctrin was from God? this is your caſe Dr, wee defy you to name as much as one among your firſt Reformers, who was as much as an honeſt man; do you name Luther? he was an Apoſtat Fryar, learned his Doctrin againſt Maſs, prayers to ſaints &c. from the Deuil with whom he was frequently converſant as himſelf confeſſes to. 7. Wittemb. an. 1558 de Miſſa Privata fol. 228. & to. 6.

Germ. Ien. lib. de Miſſa angulari. Do you name Calvin? he was a ſodomit burnt in the ſhoulder for that crime at Noyon, lived a continual Scandal to the world at Geneue, and dyed a horror to nature as his own boſom friend Bolſeck relates in his life: do you name Beza? a man proſtituted to luſt and ſenſuality as the ſame Bolſeck who knew him relates: Zuinglius, Oecolampadius Caroloſtadius, Goodman, Jacobus Andreas were of the ſame ſtamp. Neither were your firſt Reformers of England of a better alloy; Cranmer a meer contemporiſer who married and vnmarried Henry the VIII. as often as he pleaſed; in his time he writ a Treatiſe in favor of Tranſubſtantiation, for to pleaſe his Prince; and in king Edward the VI. time Zuinglianiſm being the ſwaying Religion, he altered his note, and writ an other Treatiſe againſt Tranſubſtantiation; Zuinglianiſm he profeſſed vntill he was ſentenc'd to death for hereſy and Treaſon by Queen Mary; then in hopes to ſaue his life he declared for the Catholic Religion, but ſeeing the ſentence was not repealed, he renounced again this

and dyed a Zuinglian. Ochinus of a Capuchin became a Reformer, and ſo good an one, that he ran further and became a Jew. Martin Bucer, of a Dominican Fryar became a Lutheran, of a Lutheran became a Zuinglian; he became again a Lutheran, and returned again to be a Zuinglian: Hooper and Rogers both runagat Monks; Couerdale an Auguſtin Fryar; Bale a Carmelit; Peter Martir a Chanon Regular, all married, and theſe were your Reformers, judge you what the Reformation could be; and tell vs Dr can you name any one of this company that was famous for his Virtue, Miracles, or holy converſation; nay any that was an honeſt man.

And you will be no leſs ſurpriſed Reader when you conſider what kind of men are called Reformed Brethren; Monks fryars and Prieſts, as wee haue lately ſeen run from the Catholic Church to Proteſtancy; and why? becauſe Popery is full of Errors forſooth; Tranſubſtantiation, Images, Purgatory, &c. and out of a tender conſcience and loue of Truth they forſake theſe errors, and ſuperſtitious practices of

Rome. Very well; let vs ſuppoſe thoſe Articles of Popery are Errors, and many practices of the Church of Rome are Superſtitions and againſt Gods Word; let vs commend and praiſe you for renouncing thoſe Errors: but why do you renounce and lay by, other practices, Doctrins, ad Devoirs to which you were obliged by Vow in the Catholic Church, and which in the judgment of all the Church of England are Holy, commendable and conformable to the Word of God? Be it ſo, let Purgatory be againſt Gods Word; renounce it; but its not againſt Gods Word to faſt from fleſh in lent and other dayes, your Common Prayer Book commands it; Why then do not you, Fryar, who obliged yourſelf vnder ſin to faſt the greateſt part of the year from fleſh, why do you lay a ſyde this practice? you renounced but the errors of Popery contrary to the Word of God; this is none: let Tranſubſtantiation be an error; renounce it; but its no error, nor contrarie to Gods Word to ſay your Office, your Matins and Laudes; to diſciplin your ſelf ſomtimes in the week; to liue in pouerty without any rents or reue-

news;

news; to liue in Chaſtity; theſe practices are no Errors nor Superſtitions; why do you forſake them? let Prayers to Saints and before Images be Idolatry; forſake them, if you will be mad; but its no error nor profane or Superſtitious practice, but the Counſel of Chriſt and the Practice of his Saints to forſake richs, lands, eſtates, Honors and dignities for Chriſt his ſake and liue in povertie and humility for his loue; this you vowed to do when you were a Roman Catholic; why do not you keep that part of Popery; If the king aud Parliament did enact (and it would be Much to the credit of the Proteſtant Church, it were enacted) that there ſhould be a houſe in ſom Country town wherin all Monks and Fryars who becom Proteſtants ſhould liue togither in Community vnder Obedienee to ſom Superiour as they did in the Catholic Church, (this is not againſt Scripture,) that none ſhould be permitted to eate fleſh in lent nor faſting daies, but faſt as they did in their reſpective Orders (nor is this againſt Scripture) that none ſhould be permitted to haue any Eccleſiaſtical

Benefice nor any Rents, but live vpon the charity of the People as they did when they were Catholics (nor is this againſt Scripture) that none ſhould be permitted to marry, nor to weare but meane attyre (nor is this againſt Scripture) that all of them ſhould be obliged to ſay their Divin Office, or a number of ſpalms equivalent to it euery day, and Diſciplin themſelues ſomtimes in the weeke as they were acuſtomed or obliged to do in their Orders; in ſuch acaſe indeed wee might think that ſuch as reuolted from the Catholics and became Proteſtants were moued by devotion and a tenderneſs of Conſcience, and they might with ſom appearance of truth be called Reformed Brethren; But that a company of Fryars ſhould run from the retirement of their convents to the court and houſes of great ones, from pouertie and beggery to look for Benefices and rents; from faſting, and other auſterities to which they are obliged, to eate and drink and cheriſh their fleſh; caſting aſyde their Breviaries and Meditations, and marrying; what half witted man in the world will call ſuch men Reformed

men but rather men proſtituted to licentiouſneſs and bankrupts in Honeſtie.

By this diſcours you may perceiue how little or rather nothing the Proteſtant Church has for to deſerue that plauſible name of *Reformation*; no name in the world more vnbecoming it: for a Reformation is a change of a large life into a ſtrict one; its a Profeſſion of a more auſtere life, and of more moderation than formerly was: how then can *Proteſtancy* be called a Reformation of the Catholic Religion; put the caſe in Luther, Calvin, and the reſt of Prieſts and Fryars who change the Catholic for the Proteſtant Religion: its evident by what I ſaid and by what the world ſees, they leaue a narrow, ſtrict, and auſtere manner of life, for a more eaſy large and pleaſant one; for in the Catholic they were obliged vnder ſin to ſay their Breviary euery day; to faſt the greateſt part of the yeare, to ſeveral auſterities of ryſing at midnight to the Quyre, of Diſciplin and haire-cloths; never to marry, neuer to haue any rents but liue in poverty, to liue vnder Obedience of their Superiors

with a total ſubmiſſion of their Wills to his; they were obliged to confeſs their ſins to a Prieſt, to ſubmit their judgments in matters of Religion to the Paſtor of the Church, to obey the Precepts of the Church. This manner of life is it which they vere obliged to lead in the Catholic Religion: And they forſook this for Proteſtancy, where they are not bound to any Breviary, nor other Prayers vnder ſin; where they can without a remors of conſcience make good cheer all the yeare; where they can marry and get a good Portion and an Eccleſiaſtical Benefice beſids; where they are not obliged to confeſs, nor obey any Commandments of the Church (none obliges them in conſcience;) where they may belieue whateuer they judge is the Doctrin and ſenſe of Scripture, let their Paſtors and Church belieue what they liſt: who can deny but this exchange of life is from an auſtere to a large, from a rigid to a more eaſy, from a ſtrict to a more pleaſant life: and is this it wee call Reformation? In the Catholic Church wee can haue but one faith; wee are obliged to profeſs one and the ſame

Doctrin, practice Vniformly the ſame Rites and Ceremonies; in the Reformation you haue many different faiths; you may with a ſafe conſcience profeſs what Doctrin you pleaſe, either the Lutheran, Preſbiterian, Calvinian &c. for what euer of them you belieue you will be ſtill of the Reformation. And can this be called a Reformation? which deſtroies vnity, rents the Flock into ſo many Sects, and giues vs ſuch liberty to belieue as wee fancy?

Per haps our Dr may anſwer that Proteſtancy is a *Reformation* of the *Doctrin* of Popery, becauſe this ſwarms with many Errors; but what is *Doctrin* for, but for to reform our lyues? and how can that be a *Reformation* of Doctrin, which leads to ſuch a corruption of Manners?

II. CHAPTER.

THAT THE DOCTOR HAS IN HIS Sermon paſſed his ſentence of Damnation againſt our Saints; he retracts this Sentence in his Booke; but cannot in his Principles.

OUR Doctor in his two firſt Chapters againſt J. S. pretends to caſt that impious poſition from his doore. *That in the Catholic Religion ther's no ſaluation*; he ſaies wee may; and when he ſaies, ſaluation may be had in our Catholic Church, any man would think he intended to grant a grater capacity for ſaluation in our Religion, than in *Turciſm*, or *Paganiſm*; but not a iot greater: for if you aſk him how a Roman Catholic can be ſaved, our Tenets being as he ſaies, *inconſiſtent with ſaluation*; he anſwers that by *Ignorance* or Repentance, and auers very poſitiuely that Proteſtants allow no ſaluation in Popery, if either of theſe two does not protect vs: and ſo much capacity for ſalvation, the Roman Catholics, who

are accuſed by him and his fellows to be vncharitable for denying ſaluation out of their Church, do grant to Pagans and Turks; it being the Doctrin of moſt learned Divins, for not belieuing the Bible to be Gods Word, for not belieuing the Sacraments, nay nor the Incarnation and Paſſion of Chriſt, a man will not be damn'd, if he has invincible ignorance of theſe Miſteries, or Repentance of his Errors: and this is that great charity of Proteſtants beyond Catholics, when they ſay that Roman Catholics may be ſaued in their Religion; that's to ſay, that they are in as great a capacity for ſaluation as Pagans and Turks.

He ſcrues vp the peggs of his indignation againſt me for making him author of that wicked Poſition, *That in the Roman Catholic Church a man cannot be ſaued*, and to proue him the Author of it, there needs no more, than to hear him ſpeake: Page 116. of his Sermon he ſaies, *No learned Proteſtant does allow the Popiſh Religion generally and abſoluty ſpeaking to be a ſecure way of ſaluation; for all do agree that many of their Tenets and practices are inconſiſtent with ſaluation; tho*

ignorance may haply excuſe ſom of the Simple ſort, but not ſuch as know, or with due care and enquiry may know their Errors. Now you ſhall ſee him, like the Dogs head in the pot as in the poſt-ſigns, ſtrugling to get out, and cannot: *Many of their Tenets* ſaies he, *are inconſiſtent with ſaluation*; and is not this, as much as to ſay in good Engliſh, that wee cannot be ſaued? But he ads that Ignorance may ſaue ſom of *the ſimple ſort*; by your favor he does not ſay abſolutly that ignorance may ſaue *euen ſom of the ſimple* ſort; *Haply* it may, ſaies he, that's to ſay, *perhaps* it may; nothing Sure as to that: Tenets inconſiſtent with ſaluation abſolutly block vs the entrance into heauen, if ignorance does not deſobſtruct it; and its not certain that ignorance can do it, *Haply* it may, ſaies our Doctor ſo that if Catholics do not renounce their Errors by repentance, it's a thouſand to one, if any of them euer goes to Heauen.

And obſerve he does not ſay this Ignorance it ſelf will, as much as Haply excuſe all Catholics; No but *ſom*; and what *ſom*? *of the ſimple ſort*, but not learned men, *who know, or with due care and*

enquiry may know their errors; ſhutting vp heauens gates to all wiſe men; ignorance will not excuſe them: How Dr? but *ſom of the ſimple ſort?* haue you made no *Prouiſo* for that noble Prince, who made the Epigram in your praiſe? or will you rank him among the *ſimple ſort*, for beiug ſo ſimple as to make an Epigram in your praiſe? No *Prouiſo* for ſo many Earles, Lords and Perſons of heigh quality your own boſom friends with whom you were ſo converſant and familiar? no Proviſo for Bernard, Aquinas, Bonaventure and other Saints, Pillars of the Church, and Eagles of the Schools? had I not reaſon, Reader, to ſay our Dr denied Saluation in the Catholic Church, firſt becauſe he grants no greater Capacity For ſaluation in her, than in Turciſm and Paganiſm; ſecondly becauſe it appears by his own words that all wiſe and learned Catholics are excluded by him from ſaluation, wheras he ſaies that nothing but *ignorance* can ſaue ſom of *the ſimple ſort*; thirdly becauſe he does not grant it to be an aſſured Verity that ignorance may excuſe ſom *of the ſimple ſort it ſelf*: *Haply it may*, and no more but

ſo. And is it not a pretty thing to ſee our Dr of ſo ſqueamiſh a ſtomack, as not to endure that propoſition ſhould be father'd on him *That there is no ſaluation in the CatholicChurch*: My good friend what do you driue at in your whole Sermon and new book, but to proue wee are Idolaters for our Adoration of the conſecrated Hoſt, Images and Prayers to Saints? and will you boggle at ſaying Idolaters cannot be ſaued?

You haue heard our Dr ſay *our Tenets are inconſiſtent with ſaluation*; and nothing but *Ignorance* can excuſe their Profeſſors from damnation; and this ſauing *Ignorance* he granted it only to ſom of the *ſimple ſort* in his printed ſermon; but not at all to *ſuch as know*, or with due care and enquiry may know their Errors: and being aduertiſ'd by J. S. what an impious thing it was to paſs his ſentence of damnation againſt S. Thomas of Aquin, S. Bernard and the reſt of our learned Drs and Saints; he retracts in his book what he aduanced in his ſermon, and ſaies that ſaving Ignorance reachs alſo to learned men, to Aquinas, Bernard, and others; they were he ſaies ignorant, and by

their ignorance they were ſaued: ſee you Reader what ſtreights our Dr is put into; either to ſay that Aquinas, Bernard, Scotus, Bonauẽture, and our Saints and Drs were damn'd knaues, or Ignorant Coxcoms; and to caſt ſuch an affront vpon two, the learnedeſt Schools in the world, *Thomiſts* and *Scotiſts*, as to ſay their Maſters were *two ignorant Dolts*. Who can pretend to know if ſuch men, eſteemed the Oracles of the world, were ignorant? or who can expect to ouercom his ignorance, if the ignorance of ſuch men was invincible, after ſo much time ſpent by them in reading and ſtudying the Scripture, fathers, and Councils: but Ignorant they muſt haue been ſaies Dr Sall, or they neuer went to heauen: and the miſchief is that he does not grant them Ignorance itſelf; for tho he ſaies they were Ignorant and ſaued through Ignorance, yet I will euidence out of the Church of England, and the Drs own Principles, they could not haue invincible Ignorance; conſequently that acording our Dr and his Churchs Principles they muſt haue bin vnauoidably damn'd.

Our Dr pag. 9. of his Reply giues vs

the Definition of *Invincible Ignorance*; *Its ſuch as one cannot remedy by means obvious to him acording his ſtate and condition.* He therefore who has the means obuious to him acording his ſtate and condition of life for to remedy his *Ignorance*, and remains ſtill ignorant; his Ignorance cannot be called *Invincible*, but *Supin* and *groſs*, becauſe he does not make vſe of thoſe *Means obuious vnto him*; But Aquinas, Bernard and all our learned Saincts and Doctors had the ſufficient and neceſſarie *Means* obuious to them for to remedy their Ignorance; for they had the Scripture which our Dr ſaies pag. 29. of his ſermon, and alſo often in his book, *abounds with all heauenly light* and cleerly ſets down the Proteſtant Tenets to all thoſe who are not *willfully blind.* If therefore they were Ignorant, their ignorance was not invincible; they did not vſe the means they had, *they did not ſearch with due care and enquiry*, and Ignorance will not excuſe, ſaies our Dr, *thoſe who* Know, *or with due care and enquiry may* Know *the truth.* Is it not by Scripture alone that Luther and Calvin eſpied out the Errors of Rome? is it not by Scripture, Councils and fathers

our Dr saies, himself was convinced of the truth of Protestancy ? S. Thomas Aquinas, Bernard and the rest of our Drs and Saints had the Scripture Councils and fathers and studied them more than Dr Sall; they had therefore the Means obuious to their state and condition for to remedy their Ignorance; it was not therefore invincible.

I doubt if any but our Dr would vtter such à Paradox, and I am sure none would prove it more ridiculously; Aquinas saies, he pag. 8. and the rest were invincibly ignorant, *becauſe the errors of the Church of Rome were not ſo many in his time as now; they increaſed dayly; they were not ſo knowen and cleered in the crucible of publit oppoſition; none dared to check them, and ſo they kept credit; they began to be in vſe in his time or ſom what before and were not oppoſed.* Was there euer such a wild ramble of talk, and such a heap of vntruths coucht in so few lynes? wee must not attempt to retort him by the testimony of any Catholic Doctor, for hee'l say they are all Ignorant as Aquinas; but I hope he will giue credit to his own illuminated Brethren Humfry

in Jeſuit. par. 2. rat. 5. Caron in Cronol. l. 4. pag. 567. Oſiand. in Epit. Cent. 6. witneſs, that S. Gregorie Pope and Auſtin the Monk (our Dr will ſay they were alſo Ignorant) brought into England Maſs, Purgatory, Ttanſubſtantiation Prayers to Saints, Indulgences and the reſt of our Catholic Tenets about the year 600. was this but *In*, or but *Somwhat* before Aquinas his time, wo liued the yeare 1270? *Oſiander* Cent. 8. witneſſeth that Venerable Bede who liued the year 730, was plunged in all the points of Popery wherin wee now differ: *Perkins* in Expoſit. Symb. pag. 266. acknowledges that Tranſubſtantiation and other Popiſh Hereſies were ſpred ouer the world the year 900. and Fox *Acts and Monum.* pag. 1121. ſaies, it was an Article of faith the year 1060. and Berengarius condemned an Heretic for denying it; was all this but *In* or a little before Aquinas his time? But where was the Drs Memorie or ingenuity when he ſpoke thus? is it not the vniform ſaying of Calvin and all Heteredox Writers that the Church of Rome fell into the Errors they accuſe vs of, Tranſubſtantiation, Purgatory, Prayers, to

Saints, Indulgences &c. ſom ſay the firſt 300. yeares, others the firſt 500. others the firſt 600. and our Dr has the courage to tell vs they began but *In* or *ſomwhat before Aquinas his time?*

To ſay our Tenets were not examined nor publickly oppoſed, nor arguments and books againſt them permitted to come to our ſight, is a groſs ignorance of the tranſactions of ages: did not Berengarius as your own *Fox* acknowledges, and before him the Biſhop of Sans, and many others, their Abettors, publickly oppoſe and write againſt Tranſubſtantiation? did not *Ætius* condemned by S. Auguſtin, *Vigilantius* condemned by S. Hierom, the *Henricians* condemued by S. Bernard, the *Witcleffians* and *Hußits* condemned by the whole Church, publikly oppoſe Tranſubſtantiation, Prayers to Saints, Veneration of Relicks, Purgatory, Communion in one kind &c. and do not you yourſelf confeſs. chap. 20. againſt J. S. that Scotus, Durand and Ocham did examin narrowly and found great difficulties a gainſt Ttanſubſtantiation yet belieued it? where haue you or your Camerades better arguments againſt our Tenets

than your Predeceſſors Heretics haue, and you find in Bellarmin, Peron, Becan and our Catholic Writers; but ſuppoſe S. Thomas Aquinas and the reſt of our Saints and Drs had no other Books nor arguments againſts our Tenets but the Bible, Conncils, and Fathers; do not you ſay that the Bible alone plainly convinces our Errors, and abounds with heauenly light to ſuch as are not willfully blind; they had the Bible, you cannot deny it; why then did they not find out our errors? or how could their ignorance be invincible?

Let any Impartial Reader judge if I haue been injuſt to our Dr in ſaying that its his opinion, and a neceſſarie ſequele from his Principles, that all our Saints and learned Doctors who dyed in the Profeſſion of our Tenets (inconſiſtent, he ſayes, with Saluation) are damn'd: the Poſition is impious; but muſt be ſuſtained by him; for he leaues no manner of means for ſaluation in the profeſſion of our Tenets but *Invincible Ignorance*; this, I proued they could not have had, both by reaſon and by the Drs own Principles; becauſe they had ſufficient means obuious

obuious to them acording their ſtate and condition, for to remedy their ignorance, and they did not; therefore their ignorance was not invincible, and they were vnauoidably damn'd.

III. CHAPTER.

SEVERAL OTHER ATTACKS OF our Doctor againſt the Saints: the Proteſtant Kalender of Saints examined.

I Found Aquinas and others, ſtyled by the name of *Saints* in our Drs. Sermon; and reioyced to ſee him retain that reſpect for their glorious memory; but it ſoon repented him of his devotion; he learned in *Oxford* that was not the true *Reformed* language; the purer Brethren Anabaptiſts, Presbiterians and Quakers judge it to be Popiſh; and the Dr. to giue them ſatisfaction for the ſcandal they might haue taken at his ſtyle; corrects it in his new Book: he was not in earneſt, he ſaies, when he called them *Saints*; it's but an Honorarie title, as the Compiler of London

Gazets calls the Popes, *his Holyneſs.*

In the Concluſion of the *Vnerring Vnerrable Church* I argued, that any wiſe man tender of his ſaluation ought to chuſe that Church where many Saints eminent for their Virtue and glorious for their Miracles liued and dyed, rather than that, where neuer any man was knowen eminent for either; as you would chuſe to ſtudy in a ſchool, where many men eminent for learning were educated, rather than in a ſchool where no learned man was ever knowen: Hence I concluded the Catholic Church ought to be chuſen before the Proteſtant; wheras in that wee reckon ſo many eminently holy and miraculous Saints and Drs, *Aquinas*, *Bernard*, *Bonaventure*, *Gregory Auſtin* &c. and in this none was euer heard of: Our Doctor anſwers, our Saints are only *Titular* ones, no *Real* Saints; *they purchas'd their Titles* (ſaies he pag. 228.) *by public Authority as Dukes and Earles do theirs.* Is not this a reſpectfull Child of Gods Church? who pulls down the Pillars of Chriſtianity, and ſtrips them of the honor exhibited to them by the Orthodox world.

I pray Reader if you chance to ſee

him before he reads this book, aſk him his opinion of thoſe Saints recorded in his Proteſtant Kalender prefixed to the Common Prayer book: are they alſo but *Titular* only and no *Real* Saints? was it by their merits they purchas'd their Titles, or by public Authority as Dukes and Earles did theirs? if this ſecond; aſk him what public authority was that? if a Popiſh authority; how com the Church of England to profane their kalender with the foorberie of Rome, and propoſe to the reſpect at leaſt, if not adoration of the flock a company of fellows who are no Real Saints, and place them in the ſame Catalogue with Chriſt, his Mother and the Apoſtles; and the kalender being ordained only for to eterniſe the memorie of men Eminent in Santitie and virtue, and juſtly reputed Saints by the Church, how com they to ſtuff it with men who are not real but Titular only Saints: if it was a Proteſtant public Autority? & *Vos in eadem damnatione eſtis.* Are yee alſo guilty of that foul practice, as through a vain oſtentation of your Churchs holyneſs to put in your kalender a company of falſly reputed Saints,

who are but *Titular* ones, and *Honorarily* called so, as the London Gazet calls the Pope, *his Holyness?* Are the Saints recorded in the Protestant Kalender truly and Really Saints, or not? if they be not, what a ridiculous thing was't to put them there, more than *Cromwell*, or *Arrius*, or *Luther*: if they were, I'l proue they were Saints of our Church, and consequently proue your Position, *that our Saints are only Titular and no Real Saints*, to be impious.

You haue in the Month of March in your Kalender, S. Gregorie Pope who liued the year 600. and brought into England, as I related out of your own Historians, Mass, Purgatorie, Transubstantiation &c. if he was not à Papist, ther's none in Rome; and he is a Saint of your Kalender, *and yee haue no Titular only, but real Saints*, as you say pag. 228. you haue in the same month S. Benedict Monk, who liued the year 540; famous for his Monachism, austerity of life, and Religious order: can the Protestants challenge him to be theirs, who hate Monachism as the Deuil hates Holy Water. You haue in the same month in your Kalender (but

in ours, its the fifth of Ianuary) S. Edward King of the Saxons who liued the year 1066. Ancient Cronicles beare witneſs of his devotion to S. Peter and S. John, his vow of Chaſtity, his vow of pilgrimage to Rome and the diſpenſation of this vow granted by the Pope; and the Monaſtery of Winſmeſter he built for the Benedictian Friars: was this a Ptoteſtant Saint think you? yet he muſt be a real Saint, becauſe he is in your Kalender.

You have in the month of April S. Richard Biſhop of Chicheſter, who lived the year 1255. he was conſecrated Biſhop by the Pope himſelf againſt all the endeauors of King Richard, who ſent his Embaſſador to Rome to hinder his conſecration; and the King was obliged by the Pope to put him in poſſeſſion of his Biſhoprick: all this ſmells ſtrongly of Popery: I pray tell vs, why was he put in your Kalender? was it becauſe he was a Biſhop? and why were not Cranmer, Ridley and Latimer, put there; becauſe he was of an other mold; an Eminent, and not only a Titular Saint.

You haue in your Kalender in the month of May S. Dunſtan ArchBishop

of Canterbury who lived the yeare 988. when there was no Proteſtant, nor any thing like it, he went to Rome to get his Pall from the Pope, which ſufficiently evidences he was no Proteſtant; and a Real Saint he muſt be, or why ſhould he be put in your Kalender. You haue in the ſame month S. Anſtin Monk, Apoſtle of England, ſent by S Gregory to preach the Doctrin which now you perſecut

You haue in the month of June S. Boniface B. and M. who liued the year 754 he was no Martir of Fox's Kalender; nor did he ſhed his blood for Lutheraniſm or Proteſtancy.

You haue in the month of September S. Gyles an Abbot of a Monaſtery and a Prieſt: it was his good luck he dyed the year 550. for had he liued till the Reformation he had forfeited many hundred Marks, and his Monaſterie too, for the many Maſſes he ſaid; he liued much in the exerciſe of corporal auſterities, feeding commonly on roots and herbs; lodged many years in a Caue, without any bed but the bare ground; this Saint is nothing like a Child of the Reformation.

You haue in the month of November S. Leonard Confeſſor who liued the yeare 559. built a Chappel to the honor of the B. Virgin and conſecrated an Altar in it to S. Remigius; theſe practices ſufficiently evidence he was no Proteſtant; and his being recorded in your Kalender, marks he was a Real Saint, for in your Kalender there is no other. You haue in the ſame month S. Brice Biſhop; Nephew to S. Martin and a Catholic he muſt haue bin; wheras, being baniſht from his Biſhopric he had his recours to the Pope for to be reinſtalld.

You haue alſo in the ſame month S. Hugh ArchBiſhop of Canterbury a Carthuſian Fryar who liued the year 1200. a notorious Papiſt; not only becauſe he was a Carthuſian; but becauſe he was ſo auſtere in his manner of liuing and mortificacions, that being made a Biſhop he would neuer eat fleſh, and euen at his dying houre had no other bed, but the bare ground wheron he cauſed himſelf to be laid, wrapt in a haire cloth and aſhes.

I know the Nativity of *our gratious Soueraign* is mentioned in your Kalender

for to mind vs to pray for his long and happy life; alſo *Gounpouder Treaſon* day, for to giue God thanks, for the Preſeruation of the king and Parliament againſt that horrid plot, but why thoſe Saints ſhould be recorded in your Kalender, but for hauing bin men of Eminent and knowen Holyneſs, and for our example and encouragement to the imitation of their Virtues, you neuer can tell; it would be therefore an impiety in you to deny they were true and real Saints, and it would be want of ſenſe and judgment in you to deny they were of the Roman Catholic Church, for how can the Proteſtants challenge, Carthuſians, Monks, Abbots, Bishops conſecrated by the Pope, and appealing to him in their greeuances, to be of theirs.

Now if you will act the part of a Defender of your Church, (and the credit of it, depends of your good ſucceſs heerin) you muſt ſhew vs, ſom Saints, or one Saint of knowen publickly reputed Holyneſs of life and converſation, who cofeſſedly was a Proteſtant, and whom wee cannot with any appearance of reaſon deny to be yours; as you

cannot deny thoſe Monks, Abbots, Carthuſians &c. named in your kalender to be ours: you ſay Fryars Monks and Abbots are ſuperſtitious *Bigots*, and foorbs; for all that, there haue been ſom of that Profeſſion ſo honeſt men, as to haue deſerued a place in your kalender; which is a manifeſt proof, that the Tenor of life which they profeſſed is not ſuperſtitious, nor the Tenets of Religion they belieued, are not *errors inconſiſtent with ſaluation*: I pray ſhew vs any one Miniſter or Biſhop of the Proteſtant Church, ſince the beginning of the Reformation; ſhew vs any of the *Image breakers, ryflers of Monaſteries, Perſecutors of Prieſts and Fryars, believers of Figurative Preſence, Scoffers of Indulgences* and Purgatorie (this is Proteſtancy) that was ſo honeſt a man as to haue deſerued a place in your kalender: and if you can ſhew none; then the prudent Reader will judge my diſcours to be good that any wiſe man tender of his ſaluation ought to liue and dye in the Catholic Church, where many Eminent and illuſtrious Saints haue bin; rather than in the Proteſtant, where neuer any was knowen.

But our reckoning is not at an end Dr; you remember that old charge againſt your Reformation, neuer yet anſwered; that your Separation from the Catholic Church was a Spiritual Rebellion, a formal ſchiſm: your anſwer is that the Schiſm is *Cauſally* ours; that by our Idolatry, and many other errors, wee forced you to ſeparat from vs; That wee ſeparated from the Doctrin of Chriſt, and therefore you ſeparated from vs. But all this appears to be an idle talk without any ſenſe; for, Eminent Saints, glorious for their virtues, Holyneſs and Miracles, are not to be found, but in the Profeſſion of the true faith of Chriſt; if therefore in our Church ſuch Saints of knowen Sanctity be found; its a manifeſt and vndeniable proof, that the true faith ofChriſt is in ourChurch: Now I aſk you and your Camerades; when did our Church ſeparat from the Doctrin of Chriſt? ſom of you ſay, in the firſt 300. years; others of you ſay, that about the firſt 600. This appears to be manifeſtly fals; for in the enſuing ages all along vntill the year 1255. (then Richard Biſhop of Chicheſter liued)

there were Eminent Saints of knowen and renowned Holyneſs and Miracles in our Church; (for all thoſe forementioned Saints recorded in your kalender were ours as I haue proued) therefore the true faith and Doctrin of Chriſt continued ſtill in our Church, and your Schiſm is not *cauſally* ours, but without any cauſe yours.

And truly whateuer you may ſay of your Separation; I cannot imagin how your Church or you will excuſe your Ouerſight in prefixing that kalender to your Common prayer book: I do not think there could be a more ſhamefull reproach to your Church: Quakers were never ſo tempted to ſweare, that this kalender ſmells more of a Popiſh Conſpiracy than Gunpouder Treaſon day; they will neuer belieue but that ſom Papiſt had a hand in making it; for can he be a Child of the Reformation, who put *Gregory* Pope, and *Auſtin* the Monk in *Our Reformed Kalender*, for being the firſt who brought Popery into England; and left out Luther, Calvin, Peter Martyr and others who firſt preached the Reformation? can he be a Reformed Child, who put *Benedict*,

and *Auſtin* Monks and Hugh a Carthuſian Fryar in our Reformed kalender, and in the mean time wee hang men in Tyburn for following their Profeſſion, and Tenor of life: Either the Reformation had any one Eminent Saint ſince its firſt ryſe, or not? if it had; why haue not you put him in your kalender? if it had not? had it not been more to the credit of your Church, to haue made no kalender; than by making one, giue ſo public a teſtimony to the world, how poor your Church is of Saints, that to furniſh your kalender you muſt borrow them out of our Breviary: beſids Dr, euen for the Reformation of particular Citties, and Prouinces, God makes vſe of Holy men, of an exemplar life; and to ſay that God ſhould haue intruſted the Reformation of the whole Church, to a company of turbulent Spirits, and not as much as one man in the whole company to be of Eminent Holyneſs, nor exemplar life: its againſt the grain of Man's reaſon to belieue it.

Our Dr not content to attack the Titles of our Saints; coms with a freſh charge againſt their manner of life: for

I argued in the Concluſion of the *Vnerring Vnerrable Church*, that Chriſt's Counſels, of forſaking lands, eſtates, and means, and embracing povertie; was commended, preached, and practis'd in our Chutch, witneſs the many Religious Orders, where ſeueral Perſons haue forſaken their plentifull eſtates; and no ſuch Doctrin was euer preached or practis'd in the Proteſtant Church; alſo Chriſt's Counſel (recommended to vs by S. Pauls Doctrin and example) of corporal Auſterities, Diſciplins haire-cloths, ſleeping on the bare ground, ryſing at midnight to ſing Pſalms in God's prayſe, &c. was and is practis'd frequently by all ſexes and ages in our Church; and what Miniſter or Proteſtant was euer heard of that ryſes at midnight to ſing Gods prayſes; that diſciplins himſelf, &c. Hence I concluded, that to be the Church of Chriſt, which followed his Counſels, and conſequently the Catholic to be Chriſt's Church. Our Dr anſwers like a good Chriſtian, that our corporal Auſterities and mortifications are like to them of Pagans and Heathens, tending to the deſtruction of Body and Soule; that the

Proteſtants vſe corporal auſterities ; but *diſcreetly* : that our Auſterities are deſperat and indiſcreet. And what Chriſtian will hear with patience , Chriſtian Auſterities vndertaken for the loue of God , and practiſed by the greateſt Saints of the Church ; to be lykned by Dr Sall , to the Auſterities of Pagans , to be condemn'd as deſtructiue to Body and Soule ? The Auſterity of the great Baptiſt , ſo much commended in the Ghoſpell, exceeds far that of our Monks and Fryars ; and if theirs be deſtructiue to Body and Soule , the great Baptiſt is vndon : the Auſterity and Mortifications of David ſurpaſſed far , that of our Monks , Fryars and Nuns ; and if theſe haue deſtroyed their bodies and Soules by their Mortifications ; if their Auſterities be indiſcreet and deſperat ; if they be like the auſterities of Pagans : in what a condition will Dauid be ?

Henceforth I hope , he will not pretend that S. Benedict was a Proteſtant (tho in his kalender) but a Catholic or a Pagan , for ryſing at midnight to the Quire to ſing Gods Praiſes as David did ; for his many indiſcreet and deſperat auſterities like them of Pagans ; to

which he obliged his Monks by the Rules of his Order. S. Gyles alſo mentioned in the Proteſtant Kalender muſt haue bin a Papiſt or a Pagan; ſo indiſcreet and deſperat he was in his auſterities deſtructive to body and ſoule, sleeping on the bare ground for many years, feeding on herbs and roots; no Proteſtant was ever ſo indiſcreet. To conclude, none who forſook ſilks and ſattins for a poore habit; good cheer for a poore portion; pomp and vanity for a retyred and auſtere life as the great Baptiſt did, and innumerable of our Church; none I ſay of them were Proteſtants, they are not ſo indiſcreet and deſperat: Dr Sall indeed was once ſo indiſcreet, as to haue vndertaken this cours of life; but now in his old age, he is become wiſe, and has changed his habit for good attire; his ſcant and poore fare, for good cheer; his religious retirement for a court; his povertie for Rents; his religious humiliation for a *Deanry* (which they ſay he has) his Obedience to Superiors, for a full poſſeſſion of his own Will; his auſterities and mortifications, for more pleaſure and ſatisfaction than euer

he had ; and this is the Diſcretion of Proteſtants, and the way to Saluation.

IV. CHAPTER.

OVR DOCTOR'S CONFVSED DISCOVRS of our Rule of faith : a Parallell of Proteſtants and Ancient Heretics.

HE perceiued the main Controuerſie wherof the reſolution of all others depend, to be that of our Rule of faith, and the neceſſity of a liuing Judge for to determin our doubts in Religion : therefore I ſo carefully handled this point in my former Treatiſe and with ſtrength of reaſon and Scripture proued, that Scripture alone, without an infallible liuing Interpreter was not our Rule of faith. But my Antagoniſt, reſolued to continue, rather than to end wrangling, hand les this queſtion ſo ſuperficially and ſo confus-edly that he does but hint at it heer and there in ſeueral Chapters ; nor can wee fixedly perceiue what Rule of faith he eſtabliſhs for himſelf. For Now, he

ſaies

ſaies Scripture alone is his Rule; then he layes that aſide, and ſets vp the Apoſtles, and four firſt General Councils Creeds; again he waues that, and brings in a third Rule; that's to ſay for fundamental points neceſſary to ſaluation, *the Apoſtles Creed* alone; and for points not fundamental or inferior Truths the *Word of God*, whether *Written* that's the Bible; or *vnwritten* that's Tradition: thus he hops from branch to branch much indeed to his credit; for when others find it a ſufficient taſk to hit on one Rule of faith; his wit is ſo fertil as to find three, but his luck is naught that none is good.

His firſt Rule is *Scripture alone*; this he aſſerts pag. 29. of his Sermon and page 24. againſt I. S. in his new book; and what is to be admired in ſo fertil a Wit, that he could not hit on any proof for ſo conſiderable a point, whereof the reſolution of ſo many Controverſies depends, but that only Text of S. Paul 2. Tim. 3. *Holy Scripture is able to make vs wiſe vnto ſaluation, that the man of God &c.* out of which he concludes pag. 29. of his Sermon, *that Scripture alone is ſufficient; abounding with all heavenly light for*

inſtruction to thoſe who are not willfully blind; and this alone, and nothing els of Scripture or reaſon he anſwers to my two long Chapters againſt the ſufficiency of Scripture for our Rule of faith: and tho I proved in my former Treatiſe, by many inſtances, that this Text of S. Paul does not prove the ſufficiency of Scripture; I haue no other anſwer from him, but that I am a *Twice Impious Sophiſter; that I mend the text inſteed of interpreting it*; that *I giue the Apoſtle the lie*: truly his miſtake is in ſom meaſure pardonable; for the Apoſtle was once called *Saul*; our Dr haply, miſtook *Saul* for *Sall*; and thought I corrected the text of Saul the Apoſtle, when I checkt the inference from it, of *Sall* the Apoſtat.

I anſwered the Apoſtle did not ſay Scripture *alone* was able for to inſtruct vs; and beſides the many proofs I delivered for this in the *Vnerring Vnerrable Church*; I do now again prove it: for its manifeſt Sctipture cannot inſtruct vs to ſaluation, if it be not rightly vnderſtood; its alſo manifeſt that the true vnderſtanding of Scripture is not had with aſſurance, without an infallible

Interpreter; for ſaies S. Peter 2. Epiſt. 1. 20. *No Prophecy of Scripture*, (that's to ſay aſſured interpretation) *is of any privat interpretation; for Prophecies came not in old times from the* Will *of men, but the holy men of God ſpoke as they were inſpired by the Holy Ghoſt.* Therefore its manifeſt that Scripture alone, interpreted by privat Perſons, and without an Infallible Interpreter is not able to inſtruct vs to ſaluation. He replies its ridiculous to ſay, *Scripture is able*, if Scripture *alone* be not able; as it would be *ridiculous, ſaies he, to ſay you are able to carrie two hundred weight; and when you com to the tryal you muſt haue a horſe to help you*: And by this Dialect, wee muſt affirm the Dr was not able to anſwer J. S. his book, becauſe when he came to the trial, he muſt go to *Oxford* for Engliſh; nor muſt wee ſay he is able to reade, becauſe without ſpectacles he cannot; and it will be ridiculous to ſay you can make a voyage to England, if you cannot go alone without ſhip and ſeamen. Pray Sr. was the Apoſtle ridiculous when he ſaid *Men are ſaued by Hope* Rom. 8. 24. for its evident his meaning was not that Hope *alone* can ſaue vs: was he

ridiculous when he ſaid *wee are juſtified by faith*; for its apparent that faith alone does not juſtify vs: and why ſhould it be ridiculouſly ſaid by him that *Scripture* is ſufficient for to inſtruct vs, tho Scripture alone be not ſufficient? O but, ſay you, in other places the Apoſtle ſaies wee muſt haue charity and other Virtues; and thence it appears his meaning was not that *Hope* alone, and *faith* alone can ſaue vs; and ſo do I ſay, the Apoſtle in other places bids vs hold Traditions, and the Scripture in ſeveral places bids vs conſult in our doubts, and hear the Church; conſequently S. Paul when he ſaid Scripture was able to inſtruct vs, his meanning was not that Scripture alone was able.

Wiſe men haue more than one ſtring to their bow; our Dr foreſeeing this Rule of faith was not ſufficient; ſets vp an other, which is the Apoſtles Creed alone: pag. 10 againſt N. N. and pag. 60. againſt J. S. *Points neceſſarie to ſaluation*, ſaies he, *and to the conſtitution of a true Church are thoſe contained in the Apoſtles Creed, which is a Summarie of Articles, that thoſe ſacred fountains of Chriſtianity thought fit and ſufficient to be propoſed to all*

men ; and neceſſary to be belieued explicitly.
After hauing thus magnified the ſufficiency ef the Apoſtles Creed alone ; in the ſame place againſt N. N. he alters his note , and will not have it alone to be a ſufficient Rule of our faith , but joyntly with the Creeds of the four firſt General Councils ; and as he wavers in his Doctrin , ſo his proof is abſurd , which coms but to this ; *That it's ſtrange any man not blinded with partiality ſhould imagin the Apoſtles intruſted to preach ſauing Doctrin to all the World ſhould not haue giuen ſufficient notice of it in the ſyſtem of Articles they left vnto vs : that thoſe Venerable fathers of the purer ages of Chriſtianity congregated in the four firſt General Councils ſhould giue vs but a Diminut account of Catholic beliefe.*

But S^r^ if the Apoſtles Creed alone contains all neceſſary Articles to ſaluation , as the firſt part of your diſcours pretends , what need had you to ad the Creeds of the four Councils as a part of your Rule of faith ? and if the Creeds of the Councils contain any thing neceſſarie to ſaluation , which is not expreſſed in the Apoſtles Creed ; then that of the Apoſtles alone is not a ſuffi-

cient Rule : I pray Dr is this a good diſcours , Chriſt intruſted to teach vs to ſaluation preached a Sermon to his diſciples Math 18. therefore all inſtruction , and Articles neccſſary for our ſaluation is expreſſed in that Sermon ; ſurely you will ſay this is a very frivolous and Silly diſcours ; giue me leaue to ſay ſo much of yours , which is this; The Apoſtles and Councils intruſted to teach vs to ſaluation, delivered vs theſe Creeds ; therefore all Articles and inſtruction neceſſary to ſaluation are contained in them.

Moreouer , when you ſay that thoſe Creeds of the Apoſtles and Councils contain all neceſſary points to ſaluation to be explicitly believed , and are a ſufficient Rule of faith ; Do you mean, that to be ſaued it is neceſſary to believe explicitlyall the contents of thoſe Creeds ? what ſort of men do you ſpeake of ? if of Perſons who neuer had any inſtruction , you require too much; for no Divin will ſtick to grant that men, euen after the promulgation of the Ghoſpell may be ſaued , believing explicitly the Miſteries of the Trinity, Incarnation , and Paſſion of Chriſt for

ourRedemption, tho they ſhould ignore explicitly other Articles expreſſed in the Creeds: if you ſpeake of Perſons ſufficiently inſtructed in Chriſtian Religion; wee muſt know, how far they are inſtructed; if only of the contents of thoſe Creeds; then indeed it is ſufficient to their ſaluation to belieue the contents of thoſe Creeds, and no more is requiſit to be belieued explicitly; but if they be inſtructed alſo of other Verities, which you call inferior Truths, as Infants Baptiſm, Epiſcopacy, Communion in one kind, the Canon of Scripture, and two Sacraments; then indeed tho theſe Verities be not contained explicitly in them Creeds, its needfull to ſaluation to belieue them explicitly; and I hope I need no more proof to convince you of this truth, than your own conceſſions; for pag. 60. you ſay, *that theſe inferior Verities are of equal objective certainty with fundamental Verities and are to be belieued explicitly when they are ſufficiently propoſed to vs to be revealed Truths*: you cannot deny but that thoſe inferior Verities are ſufficienrly propos ed to you and to your Church; for you ſay they are cleerly contained in

Scripture; you engage to prove them by Gods Written Word; in ſo much that you ſay its an error inconſiſtent with ſaluation to deny them; therefore whateuer you may ſay of Pagans or ill inſtructed Chriſtians, its evident in your Principles that you and your Church are obliged to belieue explicitly thoſe inferior Truths, becauſe they are ſufficiently propoſed vnto you to be reuealed Truths; but not one of thoſe Truths is explicitly contained in the Creeds; therefore all points of neceſſarie explicit belief to your, and your Church's ſaluation are not explicitly contained in the Creeds.

Miſtake me not Dr, the queſtion is not what may be a ſufficient Rule of faith to Perſons who are not well inſtructed; who neuer heard, but little of Religion: I haue, and do again grant that the Creeds contain all points of neceſſary explicit belief to the ſaluation of ſuch Perſons, who haue bin inſtructed of no more, but what is contained in them, nay I ſay more, that in regard of ſom Perſons who neuer heard of thoſe Creeds, and were inſtructed only of the Miſtery of the Trinity, In-

carnation and Paſſion of Chriſt; thoſe Creeds contain more than is neceſſary to be explicitly believed by them: But the qneſtion is, what is a ſufficient Rule containing all points of neceſſary explicit Belief to your Church and ours, which abound with light and inſtruction to faith? whether the Creeds alone contain all points which your Church is obliged vnder pain of damnation to belieue explicitly? and its evident they do not; for you ſay you are obliged to believe explicitly thoſe Inferior Truths, becauſe they are ſufficiently propoſed to you to be *Reuealed*; its an error inconſiſtent with ſaluation to deny them, you ſay; and yet they are not expreſſed in the Creeds: therefore the Creeds are not a ſufficient Rule of faith to you and your Church.

I haue in my former Treatiſe evidenc't the inſufficiency of Scripture alone without an infallible Interpreter for to regulat our faith; and becauſe our Dr does boaſt much of the conformity of his Church in Doctrin with the firſt and pureſt ages, I will briefly ſhew, their Conformity with the firſt and impureſt Heretics; for who regulat

their faith by one and the ſame Rule; tho they may differ in ſom material points of Doctrin, they haue one and the ſame faith. The Ancient Heretics would haue no Rule of faith but Scripture; and that, not as interpreted by the Church, but as each one vnderſtood it; what they found, acording their beſt vnderſtanding in Scripture; that they belieued; what they did not find expreſſed there, they rejected; tho the Councils or Church did teach it. *Theſe things are not found in Scripture* (ſaid the Arrians diſputing againſt the Conſubſtantiality of the ſon of God with the father) *and what is not read there wee reiect.* Athan. in Epiſt. de Syn. Arm. & Seleu. *If you bring* Scripture (ſaid Maximinus to S. Auguſtin) *wee will liſten vnto you; but theſe* Words *which are not in Scripture wee do not value. In what Scripture are two Natures of Chriſt mentioned* (ſaies Eutyches) *wee follow nothing but Scripture, and care not what expoſition of it the Church giues. Let vs belieue what wee read in Scripture* (ſaie the Pelagians) *and what wee do not read in it, let vs not believe it.* This was the precincts of Ancient Heretics belief; Scripture alone, their

Rule of faith; thus they trampled the authority of the Church, for to vent their fancies without curb.

If you read the Doctrin and books of our Modern Sectaries, you will ſuſpect a Tranſmigration of ſoules; and that the old Heretics are com again vpon the ſtage to act of the new, in the perſons of Luther, Calvin, &c. what they haue already don in former ages. *Our Rule of faith*, ſaies Luther l. de Ser. Arb. & to. 2. Wittem: *is but Scripture as each one interprets it; wee receiue nothing but Scripture. Wee are not to ſubmit our judgments to the Deciſions of Synods or Councils* (ſaies Calvin, l. 4. Inſtit. c. 9.) *if after hauing examined Scripture, wee do not find their interpretation and Doctrin to be according the Word of God. Its needleſs* (ſaies Barlow, in Defenſ. Religionis Proteſt pag. 199.) *that either Pope or Council, Man or Angel ſhould teach vs; the Spirit Working in our hearts and the Scriptures are to each one aſſured Interpreters Our Rule of faith is Scripture, as each Perſon of ſound judgment in the Church vnderſtands it*: ſaies the Church of England in the 39. Art. Did euer any egg reſemble more an other, than our Sectaries do

the Ancient Heretics in their Rule of faith ? ſo far from agreeing with the firſt and pureſt ages, that the Primitive fathers expreſly denyed Scripture alone to be our ſufficient Rule of faith; which I will prove with ſom few paſſages; it would be tedious to relate many.

S. Denis Areop. de Eccleſ. Hier. c.1. ſaies *Som things haue been recorded in Holy Writ; other heigher and more ſublime Miſteries, our holy Leaders and Maſters, haue from hand to hand, by preaching and Doctrin without any written Word delivered to Poſterity.* So far he was from belieuing Scripture alone contained all neceſſary points to ſaluation; that he ſaies the moſt ſublime miſteries are not contained in them: and of this ſentiment is alſo S. Chryſoſt. Ho. 1. in Act. *Of the miſteries of the Trinity and Divin Nature of Chriſt, the Apoſtles writ but very little* and again S. Chryſoſt. ad 1am. Theſ. c. 2. orat. 4. *It's cleer the Apoſtles did not deliver all their Doctrin in writing, but many points without any Writing, which alſo are to be belieued* Origen lib. 2. cont. Celſum, S Baſil. l. de Spir. Sancto. c. 27. and Euſeb. Demonſtr. Evang. l. 1. c. 6.

expreſly teach, that the Apoſtles did purpoſely omit to write plainly of the moſt excellent and heigh Miſteries of our Religion, contented to teach them lightly, becauſe the Vulgar ſort was not capable of ſuch ſublime Doctrin, and therefore committed them to the Paſtors of the Church to be declared more particularly, as occaſion required and time permitted: Epiph. Hæreſi 61. ſaies, *All things cannot be taken from Scripture; the Apoſtles haue declared ſom things by writing, and ſom by Tradition.* Of the Nature, form, Matter, and effects of the Sacraments, (Points without doubt of neceſſary belief to ſaluation) wee know ſo little, that they are knowen to vs, only by Tradition, as S. Auguſtin obſerved lib. 1. de Fide & Oper. c. 9. vpon the paſſage of the Eunuch baptized by Philip, *The Evangeliſt ſignified all things were fullfilled in that action; which tho for brevity'ſake they are ſylenc'd in Scripture; wee know by Tradition they ought to haue bin don.*

And will our Dr perſwade vs, that Scripture alone is ſufficient for our inſtruction to ſaluation, againſt ſuch emphatical expreſſions of the Ancient

fathers? No; he has a greater reſpect for them; tho he has hitherto ſo eagerly aſſerted the ſufficiency of *Scripture alone*; then of the Apoſtles Creed alone; then again of the Apoſtles Creed joyntly with thoſe of the four firſt Councils; now he quits theſe engagements, and runs vpon an other as deſperat.

V. CHAPTER.

OVR DOCTOR'S THIRD RVLE OF FAITH, Tradition as deſcribed by Lirinenſis: his Opinion of the true Church.

PAg. 84. he reſolues his faith into its vltimat Motiue wheron it reſts: *I believe*, ſaies he, *the ſon of God was made Man, becauſe I find it in Scripture* (obſerve he ſaies, *becauſe I find it*, not becauſe the *Church finds it*,) *I believe what's written in Scripture becauſe its the Infallible* Word *of God; I believe its the* Word *of God becauſe the Apoſtles preaching it, did confirm it by many Miracles; and finally, that they confirm'd it with Miracles; I believe it in force of Vniverſal Tradition, accor-*

ding the celebrated notion of it deliuered by Lirinenſis, Quod vbique, quod ſemper, quod apud omnes eſt creditum, what was allwaies, in all places and by all men believed, that is to be taken for Vniverſal Tradition.

The vltimat motiue therefore of his faith, and Rule of his Belief is Univerſal Tradition, as wee haue heard him deſcribe it; *To thus,* (ſaies he pag.29.) *wee are reſolued to ſtand, or fall, as well for diſcerning the Canon of Scripture, as for Vnderſtanding the true ſenſe of it. A Dieu* henceforward S. Paul's text, and ſo many pages of good Engliſh vnfortunatly ſpent to defend the ſufficiency of Scripture alone for our Rule of faith: now our Dr has pitcht vpon an other; he will belieue no Scripture, no ſenſe of Scripture; no revealed Truth, but what is warranted by this *Apoſtolic Lirinenſis* (as he vnderſtands it) Tradition; that is to ſay, but what is believed in all places, in all times and by all Chriſtians: whatever was denied in any time, in any place, or by any Chriſtians, our Dr will not belieue it, no, he'l ſooner hang; becauſe it's not of Apoſtolic Tradition; and hence it follows, as you ſhall ſee that you may hide all our

Doctor's faith in a Nut's ſhell.

For if he will belieue nothing that was denied in *any time* and by *any Chriſtians*, he muſt not belieue S Paul's Epiſtle to the Hebrews, James and Judes Epiſtles, nor the ſecond and third of S. John, nor the ſecond of S. Peter, becauſe all are denied by the Lutherans the Older Brethren of the Reformation: nor muſt he believe the Old Teſtament, denied by the Valentinians and Manicheans; nor the Ghoſpels becauſe they were denied by the Marcioniſts, all as Good Chriſtians, as our Sectaries: finally as I haue ſhewen in the 2. Chap. of the *Vnerring Vnerrable Church*, hardly any part of Scripture but was denied in ſom time, ſom place and by ſom Chriſtians. Nor muſt he believe figurative Preſence denied by Luther and his ſect; nor the King's ſpiritual ſupremacy, denied by Calvin, as I have proved in my former Treatiſe; nor Epiſcopacy denied by the Presbiterians; alſo hardly any ſenſe of Scripture but was denied by ſom Chriſtians, and in ſom time; and conſequently if he will belieue no Scripture nor ſenſe of Scripture, but what is believed by all Chriſtians, in all times and

and places, his faith will ſhrink to the bulk of a *grain of Muſtard*, and Proteſtants may expect he will with it, *moue mountains*, and work other Miracles in confirmation of their new Religion.

But wee are not to quarrel with our Dr for this ridiculous Rule of faith for diſcerning Scripture and the true ſenſe of it; in quality of a Defender of his Church, he could do no leſs, wheras the 6. Article of the 39 of England ſpeakes thus *In the name of holy Scriptures wee vnderſtand thoſe Canonical books of the old and new Teſtament of whoſe authority there never was any doubt in the Church, and by the word Church they mean, as the Doctor, the whole Conhregation of Chriſtians: ſo that whatever Book the Lutherans, Valentinians, Calviniſts, Ebionits, or Marcioniſts euer doubted of* (*and hardly* any but they did) *muſt be vtterly denied to be Canonical.*

Our Doctor's miſtake ſprings from the misunderſtanding of that Notion of Apoſtolical Tradition, delivered by *Lirinenſis*: if it be rightly vnderſtood, its a true Notion, and may be a good Rule of faith: the true meaning of it is; that what was believed in all times,

and places ; by all Orthodox Chriſtians ſufficiently inſtructed, is of Apoſtolical Tradition , and nothing is of Apoſtolic Tradition , that was denied at any time or place , by any Orthodox Chriſtians ſufficiently inſtructed: for if a Doctrin was, or was not belieued or denied by HetherodoxChriſtians, or heretics, matters not a pin for to be of Apoſtolic Tradition ; What is *Apoſtolic Tradition* but the *Depoſitum* of Chriſt's pure Doctrin delivered by the Apoſtles to their ſucceſſors ; and for to know which is Chriſts true Doctrin, wee muſt not go to Heretics , Turks, or Pagans. Let our Rule of faith then be Apoſtolical Tradition ; now it remains wee diſtinguiſh true Apoſtolical Tradition from what's not ſuch ;

The Apoſtles deliuered all Chriſtian Verities either in their Written Word , which is Scripture ; or their vnwritten Word , which is *Tradition* ; The ſucceeding ages began to doubt , if this or that was the Apoſtles *Written Word* ; that's to ſay , if this or that was true CanonicalScripture ; ſo alſo they began to doubt , and do this day doubt, if this or that Doctrin , or *vnwritten Word* , be

Apoſtolical Tradition: And by what teſt did the Ancient Fathers diſtinguiſh Apoſtolical *Written Word*, from not Apoſtolical? and Apoſtolical vnwritten Word, or Tradition? S. Auguſtin l. 3. conr. Creſc. diſcerns the Apoſtolical Written Word, or Scripture from not Scripture by the judgment of the Church; *Evangelio non crederem, niſi me Eccleſiæ commoveret authoritas.* I would not believe the Ghoſpel to be ſuch, if the authority of the Church did not moue me: where, by the *Church*, he did not mean all Chriſtians; for he knew that as well in his own time, as in precedent ages, many Chriſtians denied ſom parts of the true Canon; but he meant the true Orthodox part of Chriſtianity: And by what teſt did the Ancient Fathers diſcern the Apoſtolical vnwritten Word, or *Tradition*, from not Apoſtolical? by the teſtimony of the Church alſo; for in S. Cyprian's time, he and his Abettors held that Rebaptization of Heretics, was of Apoſtolical Tradition; S. Auguſt. l. de Bapt. cont Donat. ſaies it was not; and how does he proue it was not? by the Authority of the Church: *Multa non inveniuntur in Scriptura*, &c.

Many things are not found in the writings of the Apoſtles, nor in the Councils of their Succeſſors, but becauſe they were obſerued by the Church they are belieued to be delivered by the Apoſtles. He did not belieue the Validity of Heretics Baptiſm to be of Apoſtolical Tradition, becauſe it was belieued in *all times* and by *all Chriſtians*, (for he knew it was denied by S. Cyprian and many others) but becauſe it was belieued by the Church, to which (ſaies S. Auguſtin) S. Cyprian, without doubt would haue ſubmitted, had he liued to heare the judgement of the Church vpon the Controverſy. Our Dr therefore, ſince he has pitcht vpon Apoſtolical Tradition for to be his Rule of faith; for to know what Apoſtolical Tradition is; and if this or that Doctrin be truly of Apoſtolical Tradition, muſt go to the Infallible Church for to be aſſured; and if he does not he will never reſt ſatisfied, nor the controverſy be ended: which appears in controverſies betwixt the Proteſtants and other Sectaries; for Proteſtants ſay Epiſcopacy is of Apoſtolical Tradition; Presbiterians ſay its not; Lutherans ſay its of Apoſtolical Tradition to adore

the Conſecrated Hoſt ; Proteſtants ſay its not : That the Epiſtle of S. Paul to the Hebrews is Canonical Scripture, Proteſtants ſay its Apoſtolical Tradition ; Lutherans ſay it is not : I pray Dr when will yee decide theſe Controverſies ? when will yee agree among yourſelves ? never whylſt the world is world, vntill yee com to ſom Infallible living Judge (which is the Church) to whom it apertains to declare which is the Apoſtolical Written Word, or Scripture ; and which not : which is the Apoſtolical vnwritten Word or Tradition ; and which not.

It's therefore I proued in the *Vnerring Vnerrable Church*, Chap. 4. the Neceſſity of a liuing Infallible Judge, and that to be the Catholic Church, for to inſtruct vs as well in this as in other doubts of Religion : but our Dr cannot endure this arrogance and pride of ours, appropriating to ourſelues the name of *Catholic and Oxthodox*, excluding all other Chriſtiã Societies from any ſhare of that, Title : No ſaies he *you are but a part of the Church, and a corrupt one of the Church Vniverſal, which is compoſed of all Chriſtian Societies* : this is our Drs opinion of

the true Catholic Church, declared in the first part against N. N. 12 Chapt. and often in several Chapters of his second part against J. S. Nor did this Paradox drop first from out Dr; Dr Morton in his book of *the kingdom of Israel* pag. 91. saies, *The Arian Church is to be esteemed a true Church because it holds the substance of Christian Religion, which is faith in Iesus Christ son of God, and Redeemer of the world:* and again in his 4 Chap. whose Title is, *Heretics are Members of the true Church* he speakes thus; *whosoeuer believes in Iesus Christ, tho by wickedness of life, or heresy in Doctrin he should err, he is still a member of the Church.*

It was neither Wit nor maiice that put our Dr vpon such a desperat engagement but want of memory; for had he remembred many propositions advanced by himself, he would not have ouerthrowen them all by this one. Pag. 63. he tells vs Protestants *are Members* of the Catholic Church; hecause they received that dignity in their Baptism, and it is not lost but by formal *Heresy* or *Infidelity*: Therefore by *Heresy* that dignity is lost, and Heretics are not members of the Church: Now I ask you

what do' you call *a formal Hereſy* ? you anſwer in your Dedicatory Epiſtle to my Lord of *Eſſex* ; that it is an obſtinat adheſion to a Doctrin oppoſit to Scripture : But all Chriſtian Societies diſtinct from yours, and whoſe Tenets are oppoſit to yours, hold obſtinatly and willfully Doctrins oppoſit to Scripture ; for you ſay often , that your Tenets are plainly ſet down , and their Errors cleerly convinc't by Scripture , which abounds with heavenly light to all thoſe who are not willfully obtinat ; therefore all thoſe Congrations are guilty of *formal Hereſy* and conſequently are not Members of the Catholic Church.

Again ; had our Dr remember'd what he ſaid in his 10. Chapt. anſwering to my ſyllogiſm in *Ferio* , that *the true Church of God is obiectevely Infallible* ; that's to ſay cannot teach any Doctrin *obiectiuely* fals ; certainly he would neuer haue ſaid , Chriſt's Church is compoſed of all thoſe Chriſtian Societies : becauſe the Tenets of thoſe Congregations are contradictorily oppoſit ; Lutherans hold *Real Preſence* ; Calviniſts deny it ; Lutherans hold that S. Paul's Epiſtles to the Hebrews is not Canoni-

cal ; Proteſtants ſay it is &c. there-
fore ſom of thoſe congregations do hold Doctrins *Objectiuely* fals ; therefore ſom of them are not the true Catholic Church, nor any patt of it ; for he confeſſes the true Catholic Church cannot teach any Doctrin *objectiuely* fals. The Catholic Church alſo as he acknowledges is the *Pillar of Truth*, and its cleer, that thoſe Chriſtian Societies taken all togither, are not the Pillar of Truth, being guilty of ſo many errors.

Laſtly it's evident, and our Dr will not deny it, that any congregation which holds fundamental errors againſt the chief and prime Articles of Chriſtianity, is no part of the Catholic Church : its no leſs evident that ſom of theſe Chriſtian Societies hold Errors not only againſt *Inferior Verities* but alſo againſt the Fundamental and chief Articles of Chriſtianity, as I haue proved in the *Introduction* of this booke and as your own Brethren the Lutheran Writers do expreſly confeſs, as you may reade in Brierlie trac. 2. c 2. ſect. 10. ſub 13. reade Samuel Huberinus (a Lutheran) his book, whoſe Title is *Antitheſis Lutherana & Calviniſtica Doctrina*

in præcipui fidei Articulis ; the Contradiction of Lutherans and Calviniſts in the chief Articles of faith. Reade Conradus de Theol. Calvin. l. 1. art. 18. *The Calviniſts have paſs'd ſo far, as to bring in doubt, no ſmale number of chief Articles of Chriſtian faith ; the omnipotency of God ; the Perſonal Vnion of the two Natures in Chriſt ; the Communication of names in the Bleſſed Trinity ; the glorious Body of Chriſt ; his Aſcenſion ; the difference of Sacraments, of the old and new Teſtament ; the force and efficacy of Grace ; the Prerogative of Infants born of Infidels, the Lords ſupper, and Predeſtination* : in all theſe (which our Dr will not deny to be chief and Fundamental Articles of Religion) the Lutherans and Calviniſts diſagree ; and therefore the ſame Conradus writ three books of the irreconcilable difference betwixt Lutherans and Calviniſts, and in his ſecond book : art. 13. ſaies, *nos negamus inter nos & Calviniſtas in Doctrinæ fundamento eſſe conſenſum ; Wee deny any agreement betwixt vs and Calviniſts in Fundamental Articles* : and therefore Stancarus a Lutheran, l. cont. Calvin : adverti ſes his Reader ; *Beware Chriſtian Reader of the Books of Calvin, eſpecially in the Arti-*

cles of the B. Trinity ; the Incarnation , and Mediation of Chriſt ; the Sacrament of Baptiſm and Predeſtination ; for that they contain impious Doctrin , and Arian Blaſphemies. And in his book cont. Miniſt Genu. ſaies, *that the Church of Geneva and Zurich are Arians* : and Nauſerus, who of a Calviniſt becam an Arian, and of an Arian became a Turk in his Epiſtle ad Gerlachium a Proteſtant Preacher , ſaies. *I know none of our age who becam an Arian , who was not firſt a Calviniſt ; if you will ſhun Arianiſm , you muſt beware of Calviniſm* : Go now Doctor and tell vs , that your Sects agree in all the chief and Fundamental Articles of Religion ; Go and tell vs, that all theſe Sects ſo monſtruouſly devided , compoſe the Catholic Church.

VI. CHAPTER.

MY ARGVMENTS FOR THE NECESSITY of a living Infallible Iudge of Controverſies, and that to be the Church, vnanſwered.

IN my former Treatiſe I argued thus; either 'its lawfull to each one to follow that ſenſe of Scripture which *bona Fide*, after mature conſideration and prayers to God, he thinks to be the ſenſe of the text; and if ſo all the world, tho at ears for their different Tenets, are in a good Religion; and the General Councils haue bin raſh in condemning Arius, Neſtorius &c. becauſe all Hereſiarcks and Heretics will ſay (and why ſhould not wee belieue them) that they judge in their Conſcience before God, their own ſenſe of Scripture is the true: Or God has required of vs, that wee ſhould all believe and profeſs one only ſenſe of Scripture; that, and no other, which he has reuealed; and if ſo; certainly he has apointed and com-

missioned som supream Authority for to teach vs what sense of Scripture is that which he will haue vs belieue; and wee are bound to acquiesce and yeld to that supream authority, tho the sense he proposes, may not seem to our privat judgement to be the best: for if God has not appointed such an Authority, how shall I know, which of the different senses giuen to the text, is that which God has reuealed: and if wee be not obliged in conscience to obey that Authority, and belieue the sense proposed by it; then I may, and so may euery other, without any scruple reject that sense, and each one hold his own, and so there will be no imaginable way for vs to be of one and the same faith. This supream Authority I proved to be the Church, and I haue no answer from my Dr to all my discours but a very civil complement pag 29. he saies; if he thinks Scripture is not sufficient for to decide our Controversies, wee will admit with S. Augustin, the Authority of the Church, and Tradition as expounded by *Lirinensis*: But this compliance to my discours signifies nothing, if by *Church* and *Tradition*, he

Underſtands all Chriſtian Societies; for if wee muſt belieue no ſenſe of the text but what they all agree in, we muſt belieue none at all. I proued by convincing arguments that this *Teaching* and *Propoſing* Church muſt be the Roman Catholic Church; and my Dr anſwers, that *Iam a fool* as *the great Turk for calling himſelf king of kings*: aſſuredly this is a ſhort and ſmart methode of anſwering, had Bellarmin and ſtillingfleet diſcouered this methode of anſwering, they might haue reduced their great books to a few ſheets of paper.

I proued our obligation of ſubmitting to the Doctrin of this ſupream Authority; becauſe Chriſt laid his commands, not only vpon the Apoſtles, but alſo vpon their ſucceſſors in ſucceeding ages, of preaching, teaching and ruling the flock; and laid his commands on the flock not only of the Apoſtles daies, but on the flock of all ſucceeding ages, of hearing, believing, and obeying their Paſtors and Leaders, for to be conueyed all into one faith: Our Dr anſwers in the tone of a graue man; *What he ads of Obedience due from the flock to their Paſtors, is right, ſpeaking of each*

flock in regard of their ordinary lawfull Paſtors: This reſtriction, *ſpeaking of their ordinary lawfull Paſtors*, was foiſted in for ſom miſchief: doubtleſs it was to abſolve the flock of England from any Obedience to the Pope.

But Pray Dr when Luther and his merry Companions began to vent their Novelties, was there not a Church extant, and conſequently Ordinary and lawfull Paſtors, to whom they owed Obedience? were they not obliged to obey thoſe Ordinary lawfull Paſtors, and acquieſce to their Doctrin as Chriſt commands vs by S. Paul, that wee *liue in Vnity of faith* and not be *carried away with euery wind of Doctrin*? were they not then, Schiſmatics, for not ſubmitting to thoſe lawfull Paſtors? this obligation of ſubmitting to that Authority deſcended to the Lutherans; for that Church and Authority which he was obliged to obey is ſtill the ſame; and has ſtill the right of exacting obedience from the flock; conſequently the Lutherans are Schiſmatics for not ſubmitting to it: and if the Lutherans be guilty, the Church of England is no leſs; becauſe you were then vnder the

ſame Authotity and ordinary Paſtors, to which you owed Obedience, and therefore you are obliged to return.

It was to eneruat this diſcours that my Antagoniſt inſerted that word, that each particular flock owes obedience *to th ir lawfull Ordinary Paſtors*; pretending that the Church or flock of England owes Obedience only to the Paſtors of England; that as the king in each kingdom is the head of the Church ſo the Paſtors of each kingdom are the lawfull Ordinary Paſtors in that kingdom to whom the flock owes Obedience; the flock of England muſt obey the Paſtots of England; the flock of France, the Paſtors of France and ſo of the reſt. And if you aſk what way imaginable is there then, to keep vs in Vnity of faith; for it may happen that the Paſtors of England, France, and Spain may deliuer different Doctrins; the one believe the Divinity of Chriſt, the other deny it; the one belieue the true Canon of Scripture and the other deny it: this may, and does happen; in this caſe all the flock of theſe kingdoms are obliged to haue one and the ſame faith: which Paſtors muſt they

belieue ? does reaſon or Scripture oblige the flock of Spain to belieue the Paſtors of France ? or that of France the Paſtors of England ? No : why then in this caſe you haue nothing to anſwer, but that each flock is bound to obey their own Ordinary Domeſtic Paſtors, and ſo be all of three different Religions one from an other ; or that there is one Paſtor aboue them all, to which as well the flock as the Paſtors are bound to ſubmit, and obey.

And this wee will proue out of the Church of England : for, in Ireland as there is in each Pariſh a Paſtor to watch ouer the flock ; ſo there is in each Biſhoprick a Biſhop to rule the ſubordinat Paſtors ; in each Province there is an ArchBiſhop whoſe care is to keep Vnitie of Doctrin and Diſciplin among the Biſhops ; in the kingdom there is a Primat who has a ſupream Juriſdiction ouer all the Paſtors and Prelats. Now as Controverſies may arriſe betwixt the Paſtors of one kingdom, ſo there may betwixt the Paſtors of different Nations ; why therefore, as beſides Scripture and Chriſt our *inviſible* head you admit a ſupream *viſible* head ouer all the

the Paſtors of each kingdom; will not you grant a viſible Vniverſal Paſtor ouer all the flock of Chriſt and ouer all the Paſtors of different Nations, for to keep them in Unity of Doctrin: for if you read the Scripture, you ſhall not find that Chriſt ſhould have made any mention of any particular Paſtor for each particular flock; but he made mention of One ſupream Paſtor for to gouern his whole flock, *Vnum Ouile & Vnus Paſtor*: this One flock which Chriſt ſpoke of, certainly is compoſed of all the particular flocks of divers kingdoms; therefore that *one Paſtor*, which he ſpoke of is the Paſtor of all kingdoms.

The Church of England, and our Dr pag. 60. tells vs *Inferior or Not fundamental* Truths implicitly contained in Scripture, are of ſo great conſequence to our ſaluation, that it is a damnable error to deny them; that all Nations are obliged to belieue them when they are ſufficiently propoſed to vs, to be revealed Truths; ſurely theſe Truths were revealed that they might be propoſed to, and belieued by all Nations: therefore God has apoin-

ted ſom Authority in the Church for to propoſe vnto all Nations, and oblige them all to belieue thoſe Truths propoſed by that Authority: there muſt be therefore ſom Authority which has a power ouer all Nations; but the Paſtors of any particular kingdom are not impower'd to oblige the flock of an other kingdom; therfore there muſt be one Paſtor who has Authority and power ouer all. Nor will it be a ſatisfactory anſwer to ſay that God gaue the Scripture to all Nations, wherby to learn all Truth; firſt becauſe beſides Scripture, its needfull that in each particular kingdom there be one ſupream Paſtor, who has authority ouer all the Paſtors of that kingdom, as wee haue diſcourſed but now; ſo likewiſe beſides Scripture there muſt be one ſupream Paſtor, whoſe charge is to teach and rule all Paſtors of all Nations; for Chriſt gaue his commiſſion for to teach certain Truths of Religion to all Nations; *Ite, prædicate Evangelium Omni creaturæ, in Vniverſum mundum*; as therefore for to teach Particular kingdoms, you grant beſides Scripture, one Supream Paſtor in that kingdom; why not one Supream

Paſtor ouer all kingdoms ? Secondly, its not a Scripture or a Written book which Chriſt gaue to teach ; (for as I obſerued in my former Treatiſe , Chriſt gaue no Scripture , nor any Commiſſion to his Apoſtles to write it ;) but Liuing Paſtors and teachers : thirdly I haue proued and its evident that Scripture does not contain all Truths which all Nations are obliged to belieue : laſtly becauſe the true Canon itſelf of Scripture is doubted of by many Nations : there muſt be then a ſupream Authority for to anſwer to this doubt , to whom all Nations are obliged to acquieſce. This ſupream Authority was belieued by the Chriſtian World to be in the Pope and Council before Luther and Calvins revolt , to this Authority they gaue obedience then , and now they deny it ; they are therefore guilty of Schiſm , and bound to return to that Obedience.

I proued in my former Treatiſe of this ſubject that it was the practice of Gods Church in all ages , when euer any Controverſy in Religion arriſed betwixt two Parties ; it was never determin'd by their altercations, diſputes

and Interpretations of the Text; but the queſtion was deuolued to the Church conven'd in a General Council, to which both Parties were obliged to ſubmit, and he eſteemed an Heretic who would not acquieſce to the Deciſion of the Council: That no Apellation nor Proteſtation againſt the Council vnder pretence of being a Partie, or of being of the contrarie Doctrin to the Perſon accuſed, was admitted; but he was obliged to ſubmit his Doctrin to the judgment of the Council. I proued alſo at large that this was the practice of the Reformed Church, in the Synods of *Dordrect* and *Delph* in Holland; where *Arminius* proteſted againſt the Synod, as being a Partie becauſe it was compoſed for the moſt part of *Gomariſts*: but the Synod declared him a Schiſmatic, if he did not waue his Apellation, and ſubmit himſelf to its Judgment in that Controverſy, and declared itſelf to be the competent Judge in that cauſe. I inferred hence, the obligation of Luther and the whole Reformation that he ought to haue ſubmitted himſelf to the Church convened in the Council of Trent, to which the Deciſion of the

Controverſies apertained. My good Dr anſwers pag. 31. that the Pope and Council of Trent, were the Partie accuſed; that Luther nor the Reformation did not therefore, nor ought not to ſubmit vnto them: this was the anſwer of Arminius to *Dordrect*. And Dordrect judged him to be a Schiſmatic for ſo anſwering; this was the anſwer of Arius and all Heretics againſt the Councils who condemned them; and they were judged Schiſmatics for not ſubmitting; and muſt not our Doctor alſo be judged a Schiſmatic with his Maſter Luther, if they do not waue this Proteſtation.

VII. CHAPTER.

OVR DOCTOR'S DESINGENVITY IN HIS Replies to my Diſcours of Church Infallibility.

AFter I had proued the Neceſſitie of a Living Judge of Controverſies, and it to be the Church; and for to auoid all Cauils I purpoſely advertis'd, I did not ſpeake of the Pope

alone; becauſe his Infallibility was no Article of faith but a ſchool queſtion denied by many Catholics, and affirmed by many; I declared I would ſpeake only of the Infallibility of the Church, both Diffuſive, and Repreſentative, in the Pope and Council togither: and becauſe our Dr objected our Catholics were diuided in the Doctrin of Church Infallibility, and quoted *Turrecremat*, *Alfonſus a Caſtro*, and *Aquinas* to haue ſaid, that even the Pope and Council joyntly could err materially; I anſwer'd that our Article of faith was, that they could not err neither formally nor materially in *Doctrin of faith and manners*; and challenged him to ſhew me any one Orthodox Doctor which euer ſaid the contrary; and that *Turrecremat*, *Aquinas* and *Alfonſus a Caſtro* only ſaid they could err *materially in matter of fact*, but not of Doctrin: I haue for Replie from my Dr: that thoſe Authors ſay, *the Pope and Council joyntly can err materially*; and no ſquint ey'd man but ſees this is an impertinent anſwer, wheras my challenge was, to ſhew any Dr who ſaies they can err materially *in Doctrin*.

But what does he anſwer to my argument for the Infallibility of the Church Diffuſive, or Repreſentative? a ſtory of a myle long, of Clermont Colledge and *Sorboniſts*; the one defending in public Theſes; and the other impugning the Infallibility of the Pope alone without a Council: And what is all this to our queſtion in hand? for our queſtion was of the Infallibility of the Pope and Council joyntly: did not I grant in my 7. Chapt. that many Catholics denied, and many aſſerted the Popes Infallibility, and therefore I ſaid it was but a School queſtion, and I would not ſpeake of it, but of the Infallibility of the Pope and Council joyntly? you are deſingenuous Dr: and decline the queſtion: but I muſt not complain; you are very kind to me: you are afraid that my Brethren of *Clermont* will take it ill I deny the Infallibility of the Pope alone to be an Article of faith: for how will the Janſeniſts be eſteemed Heretics, wheras they were condemn'd by the Pope alone, without any Council, and its no Article of faith the Pope is Infallible? I thank you for your kindneſs; but your fear is pan-

nick: for its not only the Church Repreſentative in the Pope and Council is Infallible; but alſo the Church Diffuſive, as it comprehends all the Paſtors and Prelats; and Janſeniſm was not only condemn'd by *Innocent* the X. and *Alexander* the VII. but their Sentence was aproued by the Univerſal Church Diffuſive and ſo Janſeniſm is as legally condemned as Proteſtancy.

But is't poſſible Dr that wee have forgot the Controverſy of the Infallibility of the Church, which was the queſtion in debate? and fallen into that of the Pop's infallibilitie which is quite out of our road? not one argument or text does he bring to proue the fallibilitie of the Church, but that thredbare ſyllogiſm which I anſwered in my former Treatiſe: *Infallibilitie* ſaid he in his Sermon (and is not aſhamed to ſay it again in his new book) *is an Attribut proper to God; but it's a formal blaſphemie, ſaies S. Thomas Aquinas to giue Gods proper Attributs to any creature; therefore its a blaſphemie to ſay the Church is infallible.* The ſexton of his Pariſh of *Swoords* would haue ſaued him his voyage to *Oxford* for this argument and the

anſwer of it; for doubtleſs he knows the Apoſtles and Prophets were infallible, and conſequently there is a vaſt difference betwixt Gods Attribut of Infallibility and that which is giuen to Creatures. I anſwered him that *Intrinſic* Infallibility by nature and proper Perfection, is Gods Attribut, it being impoſſible to him in any caſe or ſuppoſition to deceiue or be deceiued: This is not challenged by the Church of Rome; ſhe is infallible only by Gods Protection who has promiſed not to ſuffer her to teach or embrace any Error; the Apoſtles were thus infallible, and the Church in *fundamental points*, as Proteſtants confeſs; and where is there any thing like a *blaſphemie* in this? or where is our Dr's ſincerity in not taking notice of, or replying againſt this anſwer, and repeating again his old ſyllogiſm as if no anſwer had been giuen to it?

But he lets flie ſom *Queries* againſt vs; firſt, if God can lend his Attribut of Omnipotency to his Creatures? and thence concludes he cannot giue his Infallibilitie: but the good Man is miſtaken in thinking wee pretend that God giues his Infallibilitie to his Church;

its not his Attribut of Infallibility he giues; but his promiſs of not ſuffering her to err in Doctrin of faith and Manners, as he did to the Apoſtles: Dr can you deny, but that he gaue this kind of infallibility to the Apoſtles? and dare you ſay he gaue them his Omnipotency? His ſecond *Quære if it be not* a damnable arrogance *to parallell the Church with the Apoſtles, Gods ſacred Organs, as all the world acknowledges?* hold Dr; not all the World, for the greateſt Oracles of your Reformation (and by this my Reader will ſee what a pretty Reformation our Dr has chooſen) ſay they were not only fallible, but they actually and foulie erred in what they writ and taught. *Zuinglius* to 2. cont. Cataph. fol. 10. *Its a great ignorance to beleeue any infallible authority in the Ghoſpels and Epiſtles of the Apoſtles*: *Clebitius* a learned Scribe of the Reformation, Vict. Verit. ar. 5. *Lukes relation of Chriſt's Paſſion is not true, becauſe it does not agree with that of Mathew and Mark, and more credit is to be giuen to two, than to one.* Luther your grand Reformer to. 5. Wittemb. printed. an. 1554. and Epiſt. ad Gal. c. 1. ſaies *that Peter liued and taught extra Verbum*

Dei, beyond the Word of God: and again l. de Captivit. Babyl. c. de Extr. Vnct. ſaies *S. Iames ſpoke fooliſhly of extream Vnction*, Calvin your Reformed Apoſtle ſaies (in Cap. 2. ad Gal. that *Peter added to the Schiſm of the Church, and ouerthrow of Chriſtian Liberty and Chriſts Grace.* Whitaker a Hector of your Church de Eccl. cont. Bellarm. Contr. 2. queſ. 4. ſaies *its evident that after the deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt, the whole Church even the Apoſtles erred; and that Peter erred not only in manners but in Doctrin.*

Now Dr tell vs that *all the World reueres the Apoſtles as Gods Oracles*; had you ſaid indeed that all the Orthodox World beare that reſpect vnto them, wee would believe you; but when you hear Drs of your own Reformation ſpeak as I have related, and many more of them ſpeak as ill, whom I omit for brevity'ſake, you need not be proud of your good opinion of the Apoſtles, nor accuſe me of inſolence and damnable arrogance for parallelling the Church in the point of Infallibility with them: if it be inſolence in me ſo to do, S. Gregorie was as inſolent as I: *I Embrace*, ſaid he, *the four firſt General Councils, as the four Ghoſ-*

pels. Parallelling the Church of the four firſt ages with the Evangeliſts in the certainty of their Doctrin; and truly by all I can perceiue of your opinion this cenſure of damnable arrogance reachs to yourſelf as much as to me; for you parallell the Church with the Apoſtles; all the Prerogative you grant to the Apoſtles is, that they are *Gods Vnerring Oracles*; I haue with particular reflexion obſerved and cannot find in your whole book that you ſhould haue called the Apoſtles *Infallible Orales*, but pag. 36. you ſay they are *Vnerring Oracles*: alſo pag. 15. you call the Church *Vnerring*; *Not properly Infallible*, ſay you, *but by the aſsiſtance of the H. Ghoſt, ſhall not err in fundamental points*; and elſs where you call her *Vnerring Oracle*: the ſame Prerogative of certainty and ſtedfaſtneſs in Truth which you grant to the Apoſtles, you giue it to the Church, and no more, nor no leſs: ſee you, may I ſay that you are *damnably arrogant* in parallelling the Church with the Apoſtles.

But wee muſt not let paſs this word *Vnerring*, newly coyned by our Adverſaries for to eſcape the force of our Catholic Arguments for Infallibilitie; they

will not grant the Church, nor the Apoſtles, for ought wee can ſee by our Dr to be *Infallible* or *Vnerrable*; but they ſay the Church is *Vnerring*: and if by the word *Vnerring* they vnderſtand any thing vnder *Vnerrable* ſo as to ſay the Church and Apoſtles are not Infallible or Vnerrable, wee will demonſtrat their impiety and *damnable arrogance*; and that the Apoſtles and Church are not only *Vnerring* that's to ſay, *will not err*; but alſo *Vnerrable*, that's to ſay cannot err. For the Apoſtles were not only *Vnerring*, but alſo *Vnerrable* in what they writ; other wiſe Scripture would not be Gods *Infallible* Word: and who can deny but that they were as infallible in what they taught verbally, as in what they writ? wheras S. Paul ſaies Gal. 1. 8. that the word he preached to them, was not of man, bnt of God. The ſame wee muſt ſay of the Church: firſt becauſe no text of Scripture does warrant the Infallibility of the Apoſtles (as wee haue ſhewed in my former Treatiſe and will appear in the next enſuing Chapter) that does not alſo warrant the Infallibility of the Church: Secondly you grant the Church is *Gods Vnerring Oracle*, that

by the assistance of Gods H. Spirit it will not err: I ask; is this a reuealed Truth, that God has promised that Assistance to his Church, or not? if it be not reuealed; why do you belieue it? or what warrant have you for to say it? if it be revealed; then the Church is infallible as wee pretend: for all the *Infallibility* wee claim for our Church, is that God has Promised in Holy Writ, to lead the Church into all truth, so as neuer to suffer her to err; which promiss being made its as impossible the Church should err; as it is that Gods promiss should faile.

In his 3. Chap. he rallies pleasantly turning one of my Arguments into ridicule: I. S. saies he, *seems not to be very strong in the belief of Infallibilitie*, because all the proof he giues for to perswade his Brethren to his belief is an imaginary comfort they haue in belieuing their Church, which guides them, to be infallible, *which comfort* saies he, *must be grounded, not vpon the real existence of that infallibility, but vpon a strong apprehension or belief of it, tho it be not extant*; and to giue som plausible appearance to this calumny, he chops my discours and

relates the one half of my words: but that my Reader may judge if my argument be as ridiculous, as my Antagoniſt is deſingenuous, I will propoſe my diſcours which was thus: If wee conſider the teſtimonies of Scripture, the conſent of ages, the multitude of Univerſities, Drs and fathers, which teach *Infallibility*; its as likely (to ſay no more) that you are miſtaken in believing Church *Fallibility*, as that I am miſtaken in belieuing *Infallibilitie*: as to the truth therefore of this Doctrin you haue no more aſſurance of the truth of your Tenet than I have of mine: thus far we are equal: but I haue a huge advantage in believing the Doctrin of Infallibility which you cannot haue in belieuing fallibility; for *faith* is our roade to ſaluation, you trauel in one faith or roade, I trauel in an other, wee are doubtfull of the roade; my advantage is, that I am guided by a Church which I firmly belieue and am fully aſſured is infallible, cannot err, cannot be miſtaken, cannot byaſs me: I am like a Traveller, who tho he does not know the roade, he is fully perſwaded, and without the leaſt doubt that his guide

who vndertakes to leade him is so knowing in the way that he cannot miss it; the Traveller goes on in his journy, follows his guide, his mind is at rest, he is fully satisfied, and has not the least feare of being byas'd: so a Catholic being fully perswaded and believing the Infallibility of his Church, liues with a quiet mind free from doubts and fear of going astray because he is perswaded the Church which guides him cannot err; and tho really the Tavellers guide were not so throughly acquainted with the roade, but that he may stray, yet the Traveller being fully perswaded that he cannot; travells with satisfaction without any feare or doubt.

But if a Traveller did not know the roade, and were perswaded that the guide which leads him, is not so expert but that he may go astray; truly he must be allwaies fearfull, dubious, and without rest of mind, doubtfull if he goes well, or if he be by as's'd. So it is with the Protestant in his faith which is the roade to, Saluation he knows not the way well; he is guided by a Church, which he belieues may err in the roade,

ought

ought not he to live and walk in continual feare? Hence I inferred that any wiſe man ought to chooſe the Doctrin of Infallibility before that of fallibility: for in believing Infallibility he does not hazard his ſaluation, becauſe in the actual Profeſſion of our Roman Tenets a man may be ſaued, ſaie the Proteſtants; ſecondly becauſe in the belief of fallibilitie it's as likely the Proteſtants are deceiued, as the Catholics in believing Infallibility: the Catholics run no greater hazard of believing an vntruth, than the Proteſtants; *it may be* (the Proteſtant will ſay) *there is no ſuch thing really, as Infallibility; and ſo the Catholics wil be deceiued. And it may be*, ſaies the Catholic to the Proteſtant, *ther's no ſuch thing as fallibility, and ſo you will be deceiued: and ſince I hazard nothing by it, and I am as likely to belieue a true Doctrin as you; why will not I chooſe the Tenet of Infallibility, which giues me reſt of mind without any doubt or feare in the full aſſurance of the truth I profeſs; rather than your Tenet of fallibility, which leaues you doubtfull and ſuſpenſe if what you believe, be true or fals; if the roade you walk in, be the right roade or no?* Let my Rea-

der be judge if this discours be so ridiculous, as Dr Sall thought to represent it;

To my argument for Church Infallibility, drawen from her long Possession of that prerogative, neuer denied to her but by knowen Heretics; therefore not to be denied to her now without evident proof, of her being an vnjust possessor, wheras possession of 1500. years is a weightie argument in all Commonwealths to maintain the Possessors, if evident proofs be not produced to proue him an in just vsurper: My Dr answers that heer I prepare a Sanctuary for Robbers and Theeves; and that what was Lawfull in the beginning, by continuance of time growes not to be lawfull; and without any more, passes by, without proving (as he ought to have don) that our Church is a Robber or Theef of this prerogative; and that in progress of time her possession was forfeited, which in the beginning was lawfull: He tells vs in his 25. chapt. that a Possessor may be questioned for his *Title*; and if he does not proue it must forfeit his possession: Wee answer; our Title is this, that our Church in

the bnginning was ſettled in the poſ-ſeſſion of Chriſt's true Doctrin; (for the Proteſtants acknowledge, ſhee wee once the true Church,) that Chriſt promiſed her the conduct of his aſſiſting ſpirit *vntill the Conſummation of the world*, and that the gates of Hell ſhould not prevaile againſt her. By virtue of this promiſs ſhe continued her poſſeſſion by your acknowledgment, for many ages: ſhee was attackt by ſeveral Heretics from time to time, accuſing her to haue fallen from the truth: ſhe was honorablie diſcharged by General Councils, and never yet condemned by any; but her Title approued and her poſſeſſion continued. Now our Dr ſtarts vp to queſtion this ſo ancient and ſo often approved a Title: muſt he not bring evident proofs againſt her, or be hiſs'd out of Court like a wrangler.

VIII. CHAPTER.

HIS ANSWERS TO THE TEXTS alleadged for Church Infallibility examined.

NOt a word of anſwer have I from my Dr to all the texts of Scripture, which I alleadged for Church Infallibility, but what replies I made my ſelf againſt them, and I anſwered: and his anſwers are two; the firſt, that what texts import the aſſurance of Gods infallible ſpirit, are not appliable to the Church, but only to the Apoſtles; which anſwer I refuted in a full and large Chapt. proving that the Church even in ſucceeding ages to the Apoſtles was and is ſtill infallible and not a ſyllable does my Dr anſwer to this Chapter: and its to be admired the Dr ſhould giue this anſwer, if he were not ſo much acuſtomed to cõtradict himſelf; for he ſaies the Church, is God's Vnerring Oracle through the Aſſiſtance of God's ſpirit; this he cannot know but by ſom texts of Scripture; therefore thoſe texts

are appliable; and if they proue infallibilitie; they proue that ofthe Chuch: but let vs hear ſom of thoſe texts; the firſt is that of Math. 16. *vpon his Rock (meaning Peter) I wil build my Church, and the gates of hell ſhall not prevaile againſt her.* What Church is that which Chriſt built vpon Peter? is it the Apoſtles alone? or his *Vniverſal* Church, which was to continue in ſucceeding Ages after them? if *the Apoſtles*; then you muſt acknowledge (and that Proteſtants will be loath to do) that Peter is the foundation, head, and chief of the Apoſtles, that their faith is grounded vpon him: If the *Church Vniverſall*, which was to continue in ſucceeding ages? then the text is appliable to the Church, and by it wee are aſſured, that the *gates of Hell*, that's to ſay Error or Hereſy, ſhall not prevaile againſt her; which is to be infallible.

An other Text Jo. 14. *If you ask any thing in my name I will do it; and I will pray the father; and he will giue you an other Comforter that will abide with you for euer, euen the ſpirit of Truth.* Three things are promiſed by this Text; and all three appliable to the Church in all ages, as

well as to the Apoſtles: the firſt is; *If you ask any thing in my name I will do it.* This promiſs vndoubtedly relates to the whole Church, and it were ridiculous and erroneous to ſay that it was made to the Apoſtles and to none els. The ſecond; *If you lone me keep my Commandments*; was this ſaid to the Apoſtles alone? was the obſervance of the Commandments required only of them in teſtimonie of their loue? The third; *and I will pray my father, and he will giue you an other Comforter who will abide with you for euer, euen the ſpirit of Truth.* If theſe words be appliable to the Church, its evident the text proues the Infallibilitie of the Church, as convincingly as that of the Apoſtles; And that thoſe words are appliable to the Church, it ſeems vndoubted ſince that the precedent words of the ſame text are appliable to her; particularly that the later words import the Comforter's abyding *for euer* which cannot be ſaid of the Apoſtles own perſons, who were not to be *for euer*;

The third Text Mat. 28. *Go teach all Nations, Baptizing them in the name of the father ſon and H. Ghoſt; loe I am with you*

vntill the Conſummation of the world. Blindneſs it ſelf cannot but ſee that this text proues Infallibilitie, and is appliable to the Church, for, whom is he to be with, vntill the Conſummation of the World? with thoſe to whom he gaue his commiſſion for to *Baptize*, *Teach* and preach: and who were they to whom Chriſt gave this Commiſſion? not only to the Apoſtles; but to the Church in ſucceeding ages; therefore this text is appliable; and the Promiſs of Chriſt's aboade vntill the Conſummation of the world was made, not only to the Apoſtles, but to the Church which ſucceeds in all ages: Nor will you eſcape the force of this text, by ſaying *the aboad of God's ſpirit* promiſed to the Church *vntill the conſummation of the world*, was only *conditional*, if they liued in God's loue and obſeruance of his Commandments; becauſe it would follow, that the Commiſſion alſo giuen them in the ſame text of preaching, Baptizing and teaching was only *conditional, if they liued in Gods loue*, and obſervance of his commandments; and ſo none could exerciſe thoſe functions, but when he is in the ſtate of Grace.

And what is to be admired is, that our Dr brings no kind of proof, for to proue that theſe texts are not appliable to the Church, but his word, and a little quillet which weighs as little as his word: for I quoted a text out of S. John. 15. *When the Paraclet ſhall come whom I will ſend from my father vnto you euen the ſpirit of truth; he will giue teſtimonie of me, and yee will giue teſtimonie.* From which text I argued thus: the wittneſſes apointed by Chriſt to give teſtimonie of him and his Doctrin were the ſpirit of God, and the Church; the teſtimony proceeds from both joyntly, from the Paraclet inwardly inſpiring, and the Church outwardly declaring; therefore this teſtimonie is infalliblie true: No, quoth our Dr the texts relate only to the Apoſtles; and not at all to the Church: no man in his ſenſes will ſay otherwiſe: and why ſo? Becauſe, ſaies he, the Apoſtles only and not the Church, *were with Chriſt ſince the beginning*, and the text in its laſt words ſaies they were to giue teſtimonie of him, *who were with him from the beginning*, which laſt words of the text, he ſaies, I fraudulently left out, and corrupted

the text: Reader I'l be judged by you if our Dr has not loſt his ſenſes as well as his reaſon; *Only the Apoſtles he ſaies, were the witneſſes apointed by Chriſt for to giue teſtimonie of Chriſt, becauſe they alone were with him from the beginning, No man in his ſenſes will ſay other wiſe.* Therefore the Church of England giues no teſtimonie of Chriſt nor his Doctrin, becauſe ſhe was not with Chriſt from the beginning; Nor S. Paul was with Chriſt from the beginning; nor the four firſt General Councils; nor a word of the new teſtament. Therefore none of them were competent witneſſes for to give teſtimony of Chriſt or his Doctrin; *No man in his ſenſes will ſay they were.* And by this you may ſee it was neither fraud nor deprauation of the text made me omit thoſe laſt words of the text, but becauſe they did not concern the controverſy in hand. And this little quillet is all the anſwer wee haue from him to proue thoſe texts are not appliable to the Church.

If our Dr did contradict but in the end of his book what he ſaid in the beginning of it; it would be pardonable; but to tell vs in his 7. Chapt. that

the texts importing Infallibilitie are not at all appliable to the Church: and then again in the ſelf ſamChapt. to tell vs they are *appliable* to the Church conditionally if ſhe be in God's loue and grace; argues a mightie want of memorie: but juſt now he ſaid, No man in his ſenſe could applie thoſe texts to the Church: the man, ſurely, has loſt his ſenſes; for pag. 44. of that Chap. he ſaies thoſe texts relate to the Church, and were pronounced by Chriſt in her favor, but ſtill conditionally that ſhe continue in Gods loue and grace: and becauſe the Church has fayled in this condition by the many crimes of her Paſtors and Prelats; ſhe has forfeited the conduct of Gods aſſiſting Spirit of Truth, and is no more infallible.

From thisParadox it follows that thoſe Promiſſes were alſo *Conditional* in regard of the Apoſtles; for neither Scripture, nor any thing but a groundleſs fancy can perſuade, that thoſe Promiſſes were *Abſolut* in regard of the One; and *Conditional* only in regard of the other: read the Texts and you ſhall ſee it: and wheras in the Apoſtles time there were many and grieveous ſinners

in the Church, (tho they were Saints themſelves) it follows that the Church in their time did forfeit her Infallibilitie becauſe ſhe was not in the loue of God, and obſervance of his Commandments. Secondly it follows the Church now has not the Aſſiſtance of Gods ſpirit in fundamental Points, and ſo ſhe is fallible in them; which Proteſtants will not ſay: thirdly it follows the four firſt General Councils had not that aſſiſtance, which is contrary to the Doctrin of the Church of England.

But let vs proue directly the abſurdity of this conditional Promiſs: This Propoſition is now abſolutly true, and independently of any condition; *The Church is the Pillar and foundatiõ of Truth*; notwithſtanding the ſins of Paſtors and Prelats, this propoſition is true; as Dr Sall himſelf confeſſes as well in his Sermon, as in his Book: alſo he ſaies in his 15. pag. againſt J. S. that the Church, tho it be not properly infallible yet it ſhall not err in fundamental Doctrin, becauſe the Church Vniverſal has, and is to haue the aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt: therefore the Church now, notwithſtanding all the ſins and tranſgreſſions of our

Paſtors and prelates, has the Aſſiſtance of Gods infallible ſpirit; for if you take the Church ſeparatly from the Aſſiſtance of Gods ſpirit; it is not, nor can it be called The *Pillar of Truth*: ſince therefore it is now truly the Pillar of Truth notwithſtanding all our ſins; it has now the Aſſiſtance of Gods ſpirit notwithſtanding our ſins; therefore that Aſſiſtance of Gods ſpirit was not promiſed *Conditionally*.

And what is execrable to be ſaid (as I obſerved in my former Treatiſe) is, that if Gods promiſs of his aſſiſting infallible ſpirit, be only *conditional*, wee cannot be ſure that the Ghoſpels are infallible: for if the Evangeliſts when they writ them were not in the ſtate of Grace, they had not the aſſiſtance of Gods infallible ſpirit; as the Dr ſaies; and in the principles of the Church of England nothing aſſures vs that they were in the ſtate of Grace then; for Proteſtants will take nothing for ſure but what's expreſſed in Scripture; and no text of Scripture mentions their being then in the ſtate of Grace: conſequently nothing aſſures vs that the Ghoſpels are infallible. Our Dr rings a

greate peale of insolent impietie against me for this execrable Position, *That nothing assures vs the Evangelists were in the state of Grace*; the censure of insolent impietie is most deservedly past; but its not pardonable, that the Dr should lay it at my doore, the Position not being mine, but an vnauoidable sequele out of his Church's Principles.

As it is an vnauoidable sequele out of their Principles, that wee are assured the Ghospels are not infallible, because the Evangelists in the principles of the Protestant Church were not in the state of Grace; wheras it's the Protestant Doctrin, that it's impossible to keep Gods Commandments. Heer our Dr will dash out my brains, (if ratling can do it) for so great a Calumnie: *he neuer heard any Protestant vtter so desperat a Position.* Haply he did not; he is but a yong Protestant. But Dr do not you tell vs in your 12. Chapt. against N. N. that the Religion of England is the same with the Religion of your sectaries in Holland, and France? and do not you know that the *Rigid Calvinists*, and the *Gomarists* of Holland do believe Gods Commandments to be impossible?

in caſe you do not; reade the Acts of the Synod of *Dordrect*; reade Luther to. 1. Edit. Jen. pag 46. Cal. Harm. Evang. in Luc. c. 10. & in Math. c. 22. & lib. 2. Inſtit. c. 7. reade *Willet* in Synop. Papiſ. pag. 564. O! but ſay you the Proteſtants of England deteſt this Doctrin: I anſwer that they do, and they do not: *they do*, becauſe in their Catheciſms and in moſt of their Authors they denie it: *They do not*; becauſe they and you with them embrace the Calviniſts, Gomariſts and others who belieue this abominable Tenet, to be your Brethren of one and the ſame Religion with you; that their faith and belief is a ſauing faith: and is not this, as much as to approue that Doctrin as Orthodox and tolerable?

But Dr did you never reade the 39. Articles of the Church of England? did not you meet in the 6. Art. and in your *Catholic Doctrin of the Church of England* pag. 103. that the Rule of faith of the Church of England is, *Scripture as each Perſon of ſound judgment in the Church vnderſtands it*: if this be your rule of faith, you'l never giue a more exact definition of your *Proteſtant Doctrin* than

this; *Whatever any of ſound judgment in your Church interprets to be contained in Scripture*: Luther, Calvin, Willet, Gomarus and his Diſciples, were men of ſound judgment and of your Church, (for you ſay all Chriſtian ſocieties are of one Church;) and they all teach the Impoſſibilitie of Gods Commandments to be contained in Scripture; therefore this is the Doctrine of the Proteſtant Church: I confeſs Proteſtants in England deny it; but I ſay they muſt and ought to believe it, or change their Rule of faith and 39. Articles.

IX. CHAPTER.

MY SYLLOGISM IN FERIO, *PROVING the Proteſtant Church, not to be the Church nor any part of the Church of Chriſt, vindicated and enforced againſt Doctor Sall.*

I Undertook to prove in the 8. Chap. of my former Treatiſe that the Proteſtant Church is not the Church of Chriſt nor any part of it, becauſe it does

not teach his Doctrin; and no Church can be called the Church of Christ further than it teachs his Doctrin: That Protestancy or Doctrin of the Protestant Church, as it is condistinct from Catholecism, or the Doctrin of the Romã Church, is not the Doctrin of Christ nor any part of it, I proved it with this syllogism in *Ferio*. No fallible Doctrin is the Doctrin nor any part of the Doctrin of Christ; but Protestancy as it is condistinct from Catholecism, (that's to say the Doctrin wherin they differ from vs, and for which they separated from vs) is altogither fallible Doctrin; therefore Protestancy is not the Doctrin nor any part of the Doctrin of Christ. That Protestancy is altogither fallible Doctrin, I proued it; becausé the Doctrin wherin Protestants differ from vs, is altogither of *Inferior Verities, of Points not fundamental*; This, no ingenuos Protestant will stick to grant; for its the expres confession of Protestants, that Catholics and Protestans agree in fundamental points; and therefore they pretend wee are all of one Religion as to the substance, and that wee may be saued in our Religion, becausé our

Errors

Errors are only in *Inferior* and *not fundamental* Doctrin, which ſhocks not the foundation of Religion; But the Doctrin of *Inferior Verities*, and Points *not fundamental* is altogither fallible Doctrin; Nor will any Proteſtant deny this Propoſition who vnderſtands well the Doctrin of his Church; for its the conſtant Doctrin of Proteſtants, and Dr Sall himſelf ſaies it pag. 15. againſt J. S. that the Church cannot err in fundamental points of faith, but that it may and has erred in points not fundamental or Inferior Truths. Therefore Proteſtancie or the Doctrin wherin Proteſtants differ from vs is but fallible Doctrin, and conſequently not the Doctrin of Chriſt.

It's a pittifull thing to ſee how my poor Dr is entangled in this argument: his firſt, and beſt anſwer is to ſay my *Theſis is Inſolent, and a big promiſing Title*; but if his anſwer be not good, it will proue as *performing* as it is *promiſing*: let vs hear his anſwer: *He will haue vs premiſs* (ſaies he) *that Proteſtants alow Papiſts not to err in points fundamental.* What ſhufling, and ambiguous terms be theſe? *He will haue vs premiſs*; what? do you

think I beg that of you as a favor ? is it not your own acknowledgement in your Dedicatory Epiſtle to the Earl of Eſſex, that the Church of Rome was once the true Church ? is it not alſo your acknowledgement pag. 15. that the true Church is to have the continual aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt for not to err in fundamental points of Religion ? do not you acknowledge in the beginning of your book that Roman Catholics may be ſaved in their Religion ? and can any be ſaved in the profeſſion of fundamental errors ? I proued in my former treatiſe that almoſt all your ſectaries confeſs rhis truth, and it is the conſtant Doctrin of the Church of England.

He goes on, but quite out of the Road, and tells vs, *that fundamental points are thoſe which are contained in the Creed*; and this is nothing to our purpoſe; for to anſwer my argument, it matters not a pin's head to know where the fundamental points are contained; or what they are; what avails vs, is to know that the Doctrin wherin you differ from vs, is only the Doctrin of, *not fundamental points*: after his long rambling he

comes at laſt to my ſyllogiſm : He grants the Major propoſition , *that no fallible Doctrin is the Doctrin of Chriſt* ; he denies the Minor , *that Proteſtancy is all fallible Doctrin* : to the ſecond Syllogiſm he,gives me for granted (and no thanks to him for it) *that Proteſtancy , or Doctrin wherin they differ from vs is altogither of points not fundamental* ; but the Minor ſtings him , *that the Doctrin of points not fundamental is fallible Doctrin* ; *ſtop heer* , ſaies he , *and an eternal ſtop ſhould be put to your tongue* : bnt what will it availe you to ſtop my tongue , if you do not cut of my fingars ? and why muſt my poor tongue be ſtopt ? becauſe he ſaies it's a formal blaſphemy to ſay the Doctrin of points not fundamental , or Inferior Truths is fallible : Indeed ? and why is it a blaſphemy ? becauſe quoth he , *it's to ſay the Word of God is fallible, for inferior Verities are implicitly contained in God's Written Word and Tradition.* Stop heer Dr and an eternal ſtop ſhould be put to your Logic : my Argument is this; Inferior Verities are fallible Doctrin and therefore not the Word of God , nor to be found in Scripture ; and you anſwer me,Inferior Verities are infallible Doc-

trin becauſe they are Gods Word cõtained in Scripture: is this your Logic? to give your Concluſion in debate, for a reaſon? you challenge me to acknowledge often in my book, that points not fundamental are Inferior Verities contained in the Word of God: for ſhame Dr; you impoſe vpon me, and deceive your Reader; you ſhall not find any ſuch acknowledgment in all my book; nay pag. 147. of the *Vnerring Vnerrable Church*, I deny any diſtinction of fundamental and not fundamental points in our Catholic Principles; becauſe any Doctrin which is ſufficiently propoſed to vs to be a revealed Truth, is to vs a fundamental point of neceſſarie belief to ſaluation; and whatever Doctrin is not ſufficiently propoſed to be a revealed Truth, is neither a fundamental, or not fundamental point of faith.

But let vs ſee how did I prove the Doctrin of points not fundamental and inferior Truths to be fallible Doctrin; for in this conſiſts the force of my argument: I proued it by the Proteſtants own Principles, for the Church, ſay they, can err, and hath err'd in the Doctrin of points not fundamental; therefore

theDoctrin of points not fundamental is fallible; conſequently not theDoctrin of Chriſt: Obſerve Reader, that my Conſequence is not, as the Dr diſingenuouſly draws it *TheChurch can err in teaching points not fundamental, therefore points not fundamental are in themſelves fallible.* No, that's not my conſequence; but thus: The true Church may err in teaching points not fundamental; therefore the Doctrin or teaching (mark I ſay the *Doctrin*, not the points themſelues) of thoſe points not fundamental, is fallible and conſequently not the Doctrin of Chriſt: for that a Doctrin may be truly called the Doctrin of Chriſt, its not enough that the points delivered and propoſed be in themſelves objectively true, but that the propoſal, teaching and deliverance of them by the Inſtructor or Teacher be infallibly true; becauſe our Act of faith or aſſent to Chriſt's Doctrin is infallibly true, and this infallible aſſurance of it, is not bottom'd only on the objective real truth of the points propoſed, but on the Authority of the Proponent or Teacher; its therefore requiſit he be infallible in teaching.

And that you may ſee howfar he is

com ſhort of anſwering my ſyllogiſm; I will ſhew you how he plainly grants all that I pretended to proue by it: for as well in his 10 Chapt. where he pretēds to anſwer it, as in his 4. Chapt. he diſtinguiſhes *Subiective* and *Objective* Infallibilitie; and tho he mumbles like one that's aſham'd or a fraid to ſpeake; yet he gives vs to vnderſtand, that the Church is *Objectively* infallible, that's to ſay the Verities and Tenets ſhe teachs, whether *fundamental* or *not fundamental*, are certainly and infallibly true; but the Church is *ſubjectively* fallible; that's to ſay the *Teaching*, *delivering* and *propoſing* of thoſe Verities by the Church, is fallible: and this is a downright conceſſion of all I pretend; for I never pretended by my ſyllogiſm to proue that the Tenets, or points delivered are objectively fallible or fals; but that the Teachers in delivering them, their propoſing and Doctrin of them, is fallible: and before wee paſs further, My Dr will not take it ill, tho I be but a Maſter of Grammer, as he ſaies, to give him a peece of inſtruction which he wants: that diſtinction he makes of *Objective* and *Subjective* Infallibilitie is

very improper, and reliſhes nothing of a ſchoolmã for the *Obiects* in themſelves are not *fallible* or *infallible*, *Probable* or *Evident*; wee do not ſay *This is a Probable ſtone*, or *this is a fallible hors*: thoſe terms are not appliable to the obiects *a parte rei*; but to the Vital intellectual Acts of our mind, which tend to the Obiects: only the propoſitions or Acts of our vnderſtanding which wee elicit on the Obiects, are ſaid to be fallible, infallible, probable, or improbable; and ſo our Drs diſtinction of *Obiective* and *Subiective* infallibilitie, is pure non ſenſe.

But ſince it has been our Drs bad luck tohit on this diſtinction, wee will make it ſerue for to better our cauſe; he grants therefore that the Church is *ſubiectively fallible*: I'l propoſe him an other ſyllogiſm and it ſhall be in *Ferio*, for I ſee he is vnluckie in that figure and Mode: *No Church Subiectively fallible, that's to ſay in teaching and delivering her Doctrin, is the Church of Chriſt; But the Proteſtant Church, as our Dr confeſſes now, and I hope will remember it next yeare, is ſubiectively fallible in teaching her Doctrin; therfore the Proteſtant Church is not the*

Church of Christ. I proue the Major propoſition : *The Church of God is to be believed before an Angel, who would teach vs the contrarie Doctrin to what ſhe delivers,* as S. Paul ſaies Gal. 1. 8. *But if the Church were fallible in teaching, wee ought to believe an Angel rather than the Church* : therefore the Church is not ſubjectively fallible. That an Angel is to be believed before any fallible Church, it's manifeſt: for that Church *ſubiectively* fallible muſt not have the aſſiſtance of Gods infallible ſpirit in teaching ; if it were guided by Gods ſpirit when it teachs it could not err ; it muſt be a congregation of men, left to their own wiſdom and prudence for to deliver what they judge to be the beſt Doctrin : and who doubts but that an Angels judgment, which is of ſo ſublime and piercing an vnderſtanding, incomparably ſurpaſſing all human intellects, is to be preferred before the opinion of all congregations of men ?

By the way let me aſk my Adverſarie ; Is his Church fallible *ſubiectively* in teaching *fundamental* points ? probably he will ſay, No, for pag. 15. he tells vs, *the Church is to have the aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt in fundamental points* : It is

ſubjectively fallible therefore only in teaching *Not fundamental* and *Inferior Truths*; which is the Doctrin wherin Proteſtants differ from vs; therefore the Church of England has not the aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt in teaching what Doctrin ſhe differs in from vs (for to be fallible in teaching, and not to have the Aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt in teaching, is the ſame thing) therefore the Church of England does not teach the Doctrin of Chriſt when ſhe teachs *Inferior truths*; now it remains, that our Dr tell vs, by what ſpirit is his Church guided and inſpired in teaching Inferior Truths wherin they differ, and for which they have ſeparated from vs; if ſhe be not inſpired and guided by the ſpirit of God?

I prove again that *Major* propoſition, that no Church *Subiectiuely* fallible is the Church of Chriſt; The Church of Chriſt eſſentially requires not only Divin Verities objectiuely infallible, but Teachers infallible in teaching, propoſing, and delivering them to vs; I proue it; for, the *Word of God*, as Dr Sall himſelf ſaies, is *Written*; (which is Scripture) and Vnwritten (that is *Tradition*)

both are of equal infallibilitie ; God's *Written* Word is not only infallible *obiectively* in the Verities it containes ; but alſo *ſubiectively* in the *Recitall* , *Relation* , and *rehears* of them to vs ; otherwiſe what reſpect would there be due of vs to Scripture , more than to any other profane book , which would contain thoſe Verities ; or to our Catheciſms , and Commentaries vpon Scripture : therefore Gods *Vnwritten* Word,or Tradition is not only *obiectively* infallible in the Verities it contains; but alſo *ſubiectiuely* infallible in the Relation, teaching and propoſing of thoſe Verities vnto vs ; this *Relation* , *propoſal* and deliverance of theſe Verities is the Doctrin of the Church , which hands them from age to age to Poſterity ; therefore the true Church is not only *Obiectiuely* , but alſo *Subiectiuely* infallible.

X. CHAPTER.

PROTESTANT FAITH, NOT DIVIN: a Survey of the Reformation's ſenſe and letter of Scripture, not able to convert any to Chriſtianity.

ANcient fathers and Divins were ſo deeply perſwaded of the abſolut and infallible certainty of Divin faith, that it was the commmon Maxim among them, *Scientia plus habet luminis, ſed fides plus habet firmitatis & adhæſionis*: *Science* has more of light and perſpicuitie, but faith has more certaintie and aſſurance; for, all the certaintie that *Science* has, is grounded vpon Principles of Nature; and that of faith vpon Divin Authority, which ſurmounts the certainty and aſſurance that Nature can give: that Proteſtants haue not this certaintie in their faith, I proued it in my former Treatiſe, becauſe they reſt their faith vpon Scripture as interpreted by them, and tho Scripture, rightly vnderſtood be infallibly true,

yet Scripture *as interpreted by them*, can have no more assurance than the fallible interpretation of them who interpret it: I proposed my syllogism thus: He who can err relying vpon a Principle, can neuer be sure he does not err, whyle he relies on that Principle only, and vpon no other: but Protestants relying on Scripture as interpreted by them, comparing one text with an other, may err (for they confess the Church may err in the interpretation of Scripture) and they will not bottom their faith vpon any other but Scripture, as interpreted by them comparing one text with an other: therefore Protestants can never be sure they do not err; their faith therefore has no absolut infallible assurance.

Our Dr answers in his 4. Chap. and in several other places of his book; *Wee haue for security of our faith, Gods infallible Word, cleerly containing all necessarie points to salvation and a good life; Wee haue also in the general Tradition of the Church, a full and sufficient certainty that God has revealed these Verities.* But how *full* is that assurance? how great is that certainty you haue, that God reuealed

(for example) his Son's Incarnation? *Wee haue a moral certainty*, ſaies he, *which ioyned with an abſolut certaintie, that whatever God revealed, is true; makes vp all the certaintie a pious and prudent Believer ought to deſire:* I am much miſtaken if I will not evidence, that our Dr has not a crumm of Divin faith: for heer is his Belief; He has *Abſolut infallible* certainty that Chriſt's Incarnation is true, if God revealed it; and this is no faith, but meer *Science*: He has no *Abſolut infallible* certaintie that God revealed the Incarnation; he has but *Moral certaintie* of it; ſo that the act of faith wherwith he believes the Incarnation, is but *Morally* certain; but a faith only Morally certain is no Divin faith; for take Moral certainty in it's higheſt pitch you can imagin, it implies a poſſibilitie of being fals; for example, that there is a kingdom extant called England, from which wee departed but three daies ago; is ſo morally certain, that it excludes all reaſonable doubts of it's being true; yet in effect its poſſible there may be no ſuch kingdom, but drown'd all in water: ſo that Moral certaintie, tho it excludes all reaſonable doubts of its objects

exiſtence; yet it does not aſſure vs that the object cannot be otherwiſe than as it affirms; but an act of Divin faith is of a heigher certaintie, for it not only aſſures vs of its object's being ſo, but that it cannot be otherwiſe; it not only excludes all doubts of its objects not being; but it excludes all thoughts of judging the object can be otherwiſe than as it repreſents it to be: what is Morally certain is true, and can in effect be fals; what is of Divin faith is true, and cannot be fals: therefore what is only morally certain is not Divin faith. That an Act of faith is not only true, but that it cannot be fals; it's lamentable that blind paſſion, and a deſperat engagement in an error has hurried men ſo far as to doubt of it: what mans heart will not tremble to think it may be fals, that the ſon of God became man, that he dyed for vs, finallie that all the miſteries of our Religion may be fables? yet all is ſo, if faith be but Morally certain; for what is only Morally certain may be fals.

And to what purpoſe do you and your Church ſo earneſtly pretend God's infallible Word for to warrant your

faith? your Reformation has from the beginning rejected Traditions, as being human inventions, Fathers, Councils, consent of ages, nothing will serve you for a test of faith, but Scripture, Gods Infallible Word; and what to do? if your faith be only Morally certain; would not a ground only Morally certain suffice for to rest it on? what needs an infallible ground for a fallible Act, if that infallible ground does not communicat its Infallibilitie to the Act? either it gives to the Act all the assurance it can give it, or not? if not; what is it good for, more than a fallible ground? if it does, therefore it makes the Act absolutly infallible.

And if your faith be only morally certain, and your Church and Religion fallible; I commend the prudence of your Church in never hauing attempted the conversion of Pagans and Heathens: for its impossible any wise man should embrace your Religion, if it were proposed vnto him in the colours wee have seen you set it out, in these precedent Chapters: Imagin two Reformed Preachers did go from England with their Bible to convert the king of

China, and let them preach to him, what wee have heard our Dr. say hitherto: Sr Wee are absolutly sure that whateuer God has revealed is true; Our faith and Religiõ is ground vpon this book, which wee belieue to be the pure Word of God, and all the contents of it are infalliblie and absolutly true; becauſe they were revealed by him; yet it's not absolutly certain, they were reuealed by him; but we are Morally certain of it, and therefore wee belieue them; this book saies, our God is one in Nature and three in Persons; and the second Person of the Trinitie became Man, dyed for vs vpon a croſs, and aroſe again from death; of all this we are only Morally certain, and wee firmly belieue it. This second Person God and Man, eſtabliſht a Church on earth wherin his Doctrin and faith ſhould be taught, wherof his Apoſtles were the chief Maſters; he gave to this Church in his Apoſtles time; his infallible Spirit for to lead and conduct her into all truth; but ſoon after the Apoſtles time, he withdrew from the Church his Infallible Spirit, and ſhe fell into many erroneous Doctrins; and now wee

haue

haue nō other guide to direct vs, but this Bible; the ſenſe of it is very doubtfull, but wee are certain, that ſenſe of it which wee hold is the true ſenſe; and of this wee have only Moral certaintie: and tho it be obſcure and the ſenſe of it ſo doubtfull, that many ſects of Chriſtians differ from vs, and vnderſtand it in a quite contrary ſenſe to that which wee hold; wee will admit no judge for to allay theſe doubts and decide theſe Controverſies but the Bible it ſelf: There is a kind of people among vs, which they call the Popiſh Church; which was the Church eſtabliſht by the ſon of God, and was once a pure and Orthodox Church; But Martin Luther a learned man, arroſe and found that the Doctrin profeſſed by this Church for many hundred years before, was erroneous; our kingdom of England followed his example, and wee do not approve either the Doctrin of that Church; nor that of Luther; wee have made a new Reformation of both; there are many other ſects in England who have ſprung from vs, and are, as ſo many Reformations of our Church; but our Doctrin is the beſt of

all; and of this wee are Morally certain, In the Popiſh Church there haue been in all ages many men eſteemed by the world of eminent ſanctitie, and holy life and converſation, which has gained thē the name of Saints throughout the world; wee ſay they were all hypocrits and no true Saints; and wee do confeſs ourſelves never had any man of publikly knowen Sanctitie, eſteemed ſo by the common vogue of Chriſtians; in that Church there has been in paſt ages, and in theſe laſt ages ſince wee are in the world many Miracles, and ſupernatural ſigns wrought by the Profeſſors of her Doctrin, in confirmation of her Tenets; and the wyſeſt men and greateſt of the world, have been eyewitneſſes of many of them, and judged them to be true Miracles, and recorded them in their books for ſuch; but wee ſay they were no true Miracles, and that ſince the Apoſtles time there has been none; it's certaine no Miracle was ever wrought in our Church: there have been very many in that Church in all precedent ages, who were eſteemed the Oracles of their times in learning, and whoſe

Books are highly eſteemed by vs; and wee ſay they were Ignorant Soules, becauſe they taught the Popiſh Tenets contrary to ours. This is our faith and Religion which wee are com to preach vnto you, and of all this faith, and all that wee belieue, wee have only Moral certainty: if you belieue our faith and Tenets God has promiſed, you ſhall be ſaued; and perhaps you may not be ſaved, for its but *Morally* certain that God has made any ſuch promiſs; and what is only *Morally* certain may be fals: if you do not believe our Doctrin, but the quite contrarie you may alſo be ſaved; for wee are ſo charitable as to belieue that all the other Chriſtian Sects who hold quite contrary Tenets to ours, may be ſaued; all is but Morally certain; all may be fals.

Now let my Reader conſider if all this be not pure Proteſtant Doctrin, and what wee haue heard Dr Sall ſay in the precedent Chapters; and let him judge if the king would not be ſurpriſed at the boldneſs of theſe men in obtruding ſuch a faith vpon him, and would anſwer them; my friends, you confeſs

you haue but *Morall* certainty of the truth of what Doctrin you deliver; and what is but only morally certain, implies a possibilitie of being fals; therefore possibly all you have said, may be fals Doctrin, and why would you have me change my Religion for yours, which for ought you and I know, may be wors than my own: you say that whatever God has revealed is absolutly and infallibly true; I do, and did ever believe the same; you say it's morally certain he revealed all the contents of your booke, I say also its morally certain he revealed all the Tenets of my Religion; If God has withdrawen the conduct of his infallible Spirit from the Church, and that the Popish Church has fallen into so many Errors, you may also fall into as many, and I would com to be in as bad a condition in your Church, as I am in, in my own Religion: I see no proof you have of the truth of your Doctrin; nor any encouragement for to embrace it, not any proof, for the Bible which you so much esteem, is challenged by yout fellow sectaries and by your Popish Church as well as by you, and what

have you, beſides your bare word for to prove your ſenſe of it, is better than that of your fellows? particularly that you confeſs I may be ſaved by believing their ſenſe of it, as well as by believing yours: and if your God has left no Judge to decide your Controverſies, and who by a definitive Sentence ſhould declare, which is the true ſenſe of it; it's a mark that he is equally pleaſed with any ſenſe that is given and believed of it; or if; he intended to oblige all to be of one ſenſe and meaning of that Bible, he muſt haue apointed ſom judge for to declare what ſenſe is that: neither do I ſee any encouragement you give me to embrace your Religion; for its no commendation of it beyond the Popiſh Church, which you haue forſaken, to tell me that you never had any Miracles, and that the Popiſh had; which tho you ſay, they were no true Miracles; yet you confeſs many eſteemed by yourſelves to have been eminent men in learning, and eſteemed by your forefathers to have been no leſs eminent in ſanctitie; that theſe men I ſay have judged them to be true Miracles;

and why ſhould not I believe their opinion before yours: finally ſince you acknowledge there is but Moral certaintie, both of the truth of your Religion, and of ſaluation in the belief of thoſe Truths; what is only Morally certain, may be fals, and ſo all your Doctrin and Religion may be a meer cheat.

Now you ſhall ſee Reader how impoſſible it is to perſwade any Pagan to Chriſtianity, or any Chriſtian to piety by the Letter of Scripture which the Reformation vſes: you muſt know, that the Reformation thought it needfull to reform the *Letter* of Scripture, as well as the ſenſe of it; and purge the Bible of ſom words which ſmelt as they judged, of Popery; and ſubſtitute in their place new terms; for examble inſteed of *Prieſts*, they put *Elders*; for *Church* they put *Synagogue*; for *Holy Ghoſt*, put *Holy Wind*; for *Chriſt*, *Anoynted*; for *Our Lord and Maſter*, *Baal and rayn*; for *Baptiſm*, *Waſhing*; for *Soul Caetas*; for *Grave*, *Hell*; for *Sacrament Secret*; for *Altar*, *Table*; for *Beelzebub*, *Lord of a fly*; for *Angels*, *Meſſengers*: this famous exchange of

terms; you ſhall find in their Ancient Bibles, particularly of Queen Elizabeth and before her time; now they are aſhamed of them, as Doctor *Harding* obſerves, who diſcourſes wittily vpon this ſubject thus.

Let a Preacher ſpeake to his congregation in the old Catholic terms of the Bible thus; *I that am a Prieſt, placed in the Church by the Holy Ghoſt, for the feeding of your ſouls, do denounce vnto you in the name of Chriſt our Lord and Maſter, that if you be not regenerated by Baptiſm; and prepared for the Sacrament of the Altar, you ſhall be condemned body and ſoul into hell, and your portion ſhall be with the Deuil, I ſay with Beelzebub and his Angels.* This ſpeech indeed has good ſenſe and might make ſom impreſſion in the Auditory. But if our Dr. ſteps into a Pulpit, and ſpeakes in the new coyn'd terms of the Reformation; *I who am your Elder placed in the Synagogue by the Holy* Wind, *for the feeding of your Carcaſſes, do denounce vnto you in the name of our Anoynted, Baal and rayn; that if you be not regenerated by* Waſhing. *and prepared for the ſecret of the Table, you Shall be condemned body and Carcaſs to the Graue, and*

your portion ſhall be with the Lord of a fly, and his Meſſengers. Would not the Auditory think, our Diuaved; and in lieu of compunction, burſt out into laughter? by this you may ſee how impoſſible it is for the Reformation to convert any Pagan to Chriſtianity, or Chriſtan to piety, if they vſe their own ſenſe and language of Scripture.

XI. CHAPTER.

OVR DOCTORS REFLEXIONS AGAINST my Reſolution of faith, a Check of his impiety againſt the Miracles of our Church.

FRom pag. 177. to pag. 184. I reſolued my faith thus: I belieue the miſterie of the Trinitie, becauſe God revealed it; I belieue God revealed it, becauſe the Church by which God ſpeakes, tells vs he revealed it; If you aſk why I believe God ſpeakes by the Church; I anſwer, becauſe the Church it ſelf, by which God ſpeaks, ſaies he ſpeaks by her; and Iam bound

to belieue he ſpeaks hy her, as ſhee ſaies, becauſe he credits her with ſo many Miracles, which make it evidently credible he ſpeakes by her; ſee if you pleaſe this Reſolution proved at large in the place quoted: My Antagoniſt ſaies it has as many Circles, as it has words; but not one Circle does he as much as attempt to ſhew, like a Phyſitian who would tell you are dangerouſly ſick, but not mention any diſeaſe you have, nor preſcribe you any remedie: He fancies I contradict my ſelf, making Miracles ſom time the vltimat reaſon of believing the Church: and ſomtime ſaying they are not a ſufficient motive of the credibilitie of her Doctrin. But I need no more proof to convince him of a miſtake, but my Readers labour in reading the place I cited aboue, of my former Treatiſe; there I expreſly ſay, (and in nowhere any thing to the contrary) that Miracles cannot be the Motive of our faith; becauſe if they be abſolutly evident, they cannot be the Motive of our faith; which of its own nature is obſcure; if they be *Morally* evident Miracles, they cannot be a Motive of faith, becauſe

its Motive muſt be infalliblie true.

My Dr read in the laſt line of my *Reſolution*, the word *Miracle*; and without any more reflexion, believed I gave Miracles for a motive of our faith: but there I diſtinguiſh two Motives, as my Reader may ſee; the firſt is, of my Act of faith, why I believe God ſpeakes by the Church; and this I ſay is nothing els, but becauſe the Church itſelf, by which God ſpeakes, tells vs that he ſpeakes by her: the ſecond Motive is of my obligation of believing this truth, and my judgment of its *Credibility*; and this I ſay, are the Miracles wrought by the Church; for theſe make it evidently credible to vs, that God ſpeakes by her, as ſhe ſaies, and when ſuch Miracles intervene, wee are obliged to belieue God ſpeakes by her: Our Adverſarie ſaies this diſtinction of Motives, the one for *our Act of faith*; and the other for *our Iudgment of Credibility and obligation of believing, is but a patch to couer the incoherencie of my Doctrin, and needleſs for any thing els; for the ſame reaſon which makes me believe, makes the faith credible, and ſhews me my obligation of believing.* This is prettie good Engliſh,

but very bad Divinity ; for before wee elicit the *Act* of faith , the judgment of its credibility muſt precede , and our obligation of believing muſt be made knowen to vs ; the Motive therefore of thisCredibilitie and obligation,is different from the Motive of the Act itſelf ; for after that this Motive of Credibilitie is aſſented vnto , and our Obligation acknowledg'd , the Act of faith may be denied , through willfullneſs and Obſtinacy ; and thus men becom Heretics : but our Dr does not loue to diue into theſe ſubtilities ; its to *flay a flea* , he ſaies.

Now you ſhall ſee a new diſcovery of the Church of Romes impietie made by my Antagoniſt in my *Reſolution* of faith : pag. 184. I ſaid , the chief and laſt motive , wheron our faith doth reſt is the Word of God ſpeaking to vs by the Church ; the Church I ſay , by which God actually ſpeakes vnto vs in this preſent age ; for wee do not belieue becauſe God did ſpeake by the Church in the 1. 2. and 3. age , but becauſe he ſpeakes now vnto vs by her , as he did to the primitive Chriſtians in thoſe ages. *A plain confeſſion* , quoth

the Dr *of the guilt of the Church of Rome: they exclude the primitive Church of the three first ages, from being the Mistres of our faith, and substitute the corrupt Church of this age*; and heer he rattles at the Pope and Rome. For my part, I see no discouerie heer, but of his disingenuitie, shutting his eyes that he might not see; for I say, that God speakes to vs by the Church of this present age, as he did speake to the primitive Christians by the Church of the first ages; where then do I exclude the Primitive Church from being the Mistres of our faith; the Church in the primitive ages was the Mistres and Oracle, by which God spoke in those ages; the Church in this present age is the Oracle by which he speakes to vs, the Church in all ages is the same, and speakes but the same; but it's not enough for vs in this age that the Church spoke this Doctrin, but wee must have the testimonie of the Church of this age, that this is the Doctrin that was taught by the Church in those former ages, for to confound Heretics and Nouellers, who deny our Doctrin was taught in the primitive ages; and this is the rea-

ſon, why I have ſaid, that the motive of our faith is the Word of God ſpeaking by the Church, not in the 1. 2. and 3. age, but in this age; for it would little auaile vs for our faith, that God ſpoke by his Church in thoſe ages, if the Church of this age did not aſcertain vs that the Church then did ſpeake, as nowſhe does

An othet ſcruple troubles our Dr that I ſhould ſay wee are bound to belieue God ſpeakes by the Church, becauſe he credits her with Miracles; *and where be thoſe Miracles*, ſaies he, *wrought by the Council of Trent, which make it credible to me that God ſpeakes by it?* if a Council *were conven'd now, to condemn Ianſeniſm, I muſt believeGod ſpeakes by the Church in that Council; and are you ſure to find Miracles at hand, as ſoon as the Council is joyned?* Our Dr rallies merrily; let vs follow his mode and help him to ſport; Do not you pretend, that your Proteſtant Doctrin delivered in this age is evidently credible by the Miracles of the Apoſtles, and the old Teſtament? ſo you would perſwade vs pag. 56. have you any Miracles of this age to credit it? had the Parliament Miracles at hand, cut and

dry, when it framed the 39. Articles? No; you ſay your Doctrin of this age is the ſame which was taught by the Apoſtles; and its ſufficiently credited by the Miracles, you ſay, which the Apoſtles and Moyſes wrought, when they preacht it: pray Dr take the like anſwer from vs; our Doctrin delivered by the Council of Trent, of Tranſubſtantiation, Purgatorie &c. is the ſame which S. Bernard, Bonaventure, Gregorie, S. Auſtin, preached and Confirmed with Miracles; what obligation then has Gods Providence; or what Title has our curioſitie for to expect newMiracles for the confirmation of the ſame Doctrin? beſides Dr that the Doctrin of the Council of Trent was preached in this our age, by that great Apoſtle of the Indies S. Francis Xaverius; and confirmed by him with innumerable Miracles; pray ſhew vs but one Miracle wrought in this, or any of the precedent ages in confirmation of yours. Three things I proued in my former Treatiſe; firſt that Miracles are vncontrolled proofs of the Infallibilitie of the Church's Doctrin; it being impoſſible that God ſhould confirm the

leaſt vntruth by a Miracle: ſecondly I related ſom Miracles related by S. Auguſtin, S. Bernard, Godfredus, John Hieroſolimitanus; and believed by them to be true Miracles: thirdly I proved our obligation of believing them to have been true Miracles. Our Dr's firſt anſwer is; *Let not I.S. expect from me to beſtow my time in examining the truth of his Miracles*: and ought not any man to expect it? you confeſs pag. 56. Miracles are a moſt congruous way and a ſtrong proof of the true Church; when I alleadge therefore this congruous way and ſtrong proof for my Tenets; ought not you to beſtow your time in weakenning them, rather than in ſcolding and railing?

His ſecond anſwer is that all our Miracles are but a ſtock of *Romances*; I gueſt wee ſhould have this ſhort anſwer; and therefore I did not only relate ſom Miracles, but proved convincingly they were true Miracles, and that no man in his ſenſes could deny them to be ſuch; if my Antagoniſt had remembred the duty of a Diſputant, he ſhould have endeauored to invalid my proofs, and not be contented to tell vs they

are but *Romances*; Can any man in his wits deny, but that S. Auguſtin, S. Bernard, S. Gregorie and many Ancient fathers of the Church had as good Wits as Dr Sall? they could therefore diſcern betwixt a Miracle and a *Romance as* well as he; they relate the Miracles produced by me in the *Vnerring Vnerrable Church*; they were eye witneſſes of ſom of them; they judged them to be true Miracles and recorded them in their books for ſuch: which will you believe Reader, Dr Sall who ſaies they were Romances: or thoſe Saints, who ſay they were Miracles? I deſired our Dr that he ſhould tell vs, by what art did he and his Church come to know, thoſe Miracles were not true ones; for its ſtrange that S. Auguſtin and other Saints and learned men who lived when they were wrought, did not diſcern it; and our Dr after ſo many years has found out they were but fourberies? ſure he muſt be a conjurer; but not a ſyllable does our Dr anſwer; *ipſe dixit*, they are *Romances*, and ther's all: I aſked would not he be eſteemed a mad man, who would ſay there was no ſuch man in the word as Julius Cæſar, of which

which truth wee have no other aſſurance, but the teſtimonie of Heathen Writers; S. Auguſtin and our other Saints, are as credible witneſſes, I hope, as they; if therefore they tell vs they have ſeen Miracles wrought, is it not great obſtinacy in our Dr to deny them, and ſay they are all *Romances*.

Is this the man who profeſſes ſo much Veneration to the fathers of the Church, to make them *Romance* Writers? fourbs, who recorded ſtrange paſſages which never happen'd; or fools who knew not to diſtinguiſh them from a Legerdemain? when wee hear ſuch an irreverence againſt the Pillars of Chriſtianitie, and the workes judged by them to be Miracles, irreligiouſly parallell'd with the wonders related by *Valerius Maximus* and *Titus Livius* in confirmation of their Heatheniſh ſuperſtition, what can wee ſay but with S. Auguſtin l. de Vtil. credendi c. 18 *Niſi pietas & pax mentis accedat, de fide nihil prorſus intelligi poteſt*: where the Will is not piouſly inclined, and the heart free from prejudice, nothing can be vnderſtood of faith: *Excæcavit eos malitia eorum*, (ſaies God Sap 2. *& neſcierunt Sacramenta Dei*, their

paſſion pinfolds their reaſon, and they cannot ſee the ſacred miſteries of our Religion; Our Devotion to them is Hipocriſie; our Auſterity of life, is Heatheniſh exceſs of rigor; our Images are Idols; our Sacraments are human inventions; our Miracles are Romances; our Indulgences, Proceſſions, and Lyturgie are but ſuperſtitions: this is the humor of our age to ſcoff and ieer; to turn into ridicule, and againſt reaſon, what their reaſon cannot grapple. Since our Dr is becom of this humor let him, with his merry companions ſcoffers of Miracles, prepare ſport for this, which he will call a *Romance*, and S. Aug. reckons as a Miracle l. 22. de Civit. Dei cap. 4. Apoore Man, ſaies S. Aug. named Florentius, having loſt his cloake and having no monies to buy one, betooke himſelf to the 20. Martirs whoſe Memorie (ſaies he) was with vs very famous, and praied to them with a loud voice, aſking a Cloake of them; ſom yongmen, who were preſent, ieered the godly man's ſimplicitie, as if he did expect monies from the Saints; probably our Dr will keep them company in their merriment: the poore man departed,

betook himſelf to the ſea ſide to walk, and found agreat fiſh on the ſhore ; he took it and ſold it ; the Perſon who bought it opening its belly found in it a gold ring , and hearing what had happend to the good man , gave him the ring , ſaying , behold how the 20. Martirs do cloath thee ; If our Dr will read more *Romances* of this kind , let him read Nazian. l. 11. de obitu Gorgoniæ ; S. Nilus Epiſt. ad Athan. S. Cyprian in Serm. de Lapſis ; Chryſoſt. de Sacerd. l. 6. and Theodoret c. 8. de Græcis Affect.

Our Doctor's laſt anſwer to my proof of Miracles for the truth of our Tenets, is that he accepts willingly a trial of our Religion by Miracles : Very good ; couragiouſly Dr ; let's ſee, produce your Miracles, *Wee have* , ſaies he pag. 56. *in favor of our belief all the Miracles recorded in the Old and new Teſtament.* But to whom do you ſpeake Dr ? if you ſpeak to a Pagan , he will replie , as you do to vs againſt our Miracles ; that the Miracles of the Old , and new teſtament , prove no more the truth of your Religion than the Wonders related by Valerius Maximus prove the truth of

Paganiſm; if you ſpeake to vs Catholics, wee aſk you; what right have you to thoſe Miracles more than Arians, Neſtorians or Pelagians? and who will not laugh to heare the Miracles of the Old teſtament, or thoſe of the new, alleadged to prove Proteſtancy: yes indeed; Moyſes his miraculous faſting for 40. daies, and the great Baptiſts miraculous auſteritie of life and faſting from wine and ſtrong liquor; was to prove the Proteſtant Tenet of not faſting; Eliſæus his raiſing the dead, by the touch of his bones, was to prove the Proteſtant Doctrin againſt the Veneration of Saints Relicks; the Miracles of the Ark of the teſtament (God's Image as Calvin himſelf calls it) were directly to credit the Proteſtants contempt of Images; Chriſt turned the Water into Wine for to prove he could not turn the bread in the ſupper into his body; and that miraculous puniſhment of Ananias and Zaphira ſtruck dead at S. Peters feet, for retaining a part of their goods, which by vow they had conſecrated to God's ſervice; was to prove the Proteſtant Tenet and practice, that fryars, who have made a ſolemn vow

of Povertie, may breake that vow, and look for Rents and Benefices in the Proteſtant Church. Can any thing appeare more ridiculous, than to pretend theſe Miracles were wrought to prove Proteſtant Doctrin?

XII. CHAPTER.

IF THE PRINCIPLES OF THE ROMAN Catholic Religion, be inconſiſtent with Subject's Loyaltie to their Prince?

THE Pulpits in England did ring for a long time with bitter invectives againſt Popiſh Idolatry; againſt the Pope as an Antichriſt; againſt Rome as the whore of Babylon: theſe were for a time our Adverſari's grand charge; ſcare-crows for to ſtricke popular ſoules into a feare and hatred of our Religion; the wyſer ſort perceiuing the weakneſs of it, and that Roman Catholics are not ſo deuoid of common ſenſe, as to adore Images, and Saints as God; nor the Pope ſo monſtruouſly wicked, as to be an Antichriſt; they relent in this attack, and ſpeak but lowly of it in

corners, and vulgar ears in so much that Dr *Stillingfleet* is blamed by his greatest friends for engaging his pen in that calumny, now hiss'd at by all sober Protestants. Now the calumny in Vogue is that our Catholic Religion is not consistent with the safetie of Soveraigns; that our Obedience to a forreign spiritual father, cannot be matcht with that which wee ow to our Prince; that if the Pope be our supream head in Spiritual affairs, wee must have two Soveraigns in one kingdom; that wee allow Popes may vnthrone kings, and consequently kings are but Tenants at Will to him. This is the firebrand which has kindled the combustions of our kingdoms; this pretext of securing our Loyaltie by an oath of Supremacie, made our Princes, against their innate benignitie, severe to their best deserving Subjects; drowned our land in subjects blood, and render'd our kingdoms and government odious to neighbouring Princes, who secure their peace and safetie in the due obedience of their Subjects without oaths or other oppressions of their consciences.

Wee must then disabuse the World by examining, how far are the Princi-

ples of Proteſtancie conſiſtent with the ſafetie of Princes, and Loyaltie of Subjects; and demonſtrat that thoſe of our Catholic Religion are incomparablie more; that tho Proteſtants be in effect as Loyal Subjects as any others; its that aw which Nature has printed in the hearts of Subjects to be ſo; Its common honeſtie and reaſon leads them to be ſo. The Tenets of their Religion leade them to the contrary. For to know what is the Doctrin of the Church of England, wee are not to be ſaid by Dr Sall, Dr Stillingfleet, or other particular Drs who contradict one an other, and themſelves at every turning of a leaf; Wee are to ſee the Rule of faith Vnanimouſly received by the whole Reformation; and by it to judge what Doctrin they profeſs: the Rule of faith and fundamental Principle wheron the whole Reformation reſts, is expreſſed in the 6. Art. of the 39, of England; *Our Rule of faith is nothing els but Scripture as each perſon of ſound judgment in the Church vnderſtands it.* Luther looked vpon this Rule, (and he was a Perſon of ſound judgment, you will ſay) and delivered his Doctrin vpon it thus, Tom. 2. Germ. de ſæcul.

Poteſt. & tom. 7. Wittemb. fol. 327. *Among Chriſtians none ought to be a Magiſtrat, all are equal, none ſuperior but Ieſus Chriſt.* Zuinglius read this Rule, and delivered his Doctrin to. 6. in Expl. Art. fol. 82. *Kings ought to be depoſed by their Subjects, if they do not govern well*: Calvin read this Rule, and delivered his judgment in Dan.c. 6. ver. 22. *Kings if they be ſinners forfeit their power; ought to be ſcorn'd rather than obeyed*: Beza, Fox, Knox, Bucanan, and others of the firſt Reformers, defended by Scripture, as they interpreted it, that it is lawfull for Subjects to raiſe arms againſt, and depriue their Prince of his kingdom and life, if he does not eſtabliſh the Reformation; reade Bryerly's Apologie trac. 3. ſect. 2. and that you may not want Domeſtic Abbettors of this execrable Doctrin reade the *Trial of the Regicides* where you will find in the Trial of *Parſon Peters* innumerable texts of Scripture, which in ſeveral Sermons he preached, for to exaſperat the people againſt the authority and life of their king; reade *the Hue and Cry of Iudge Cook* proving by Scripture and reaſon the juſtice of that vnparallell'd Murther of our gratious

king: was not this the general Doctrin of all England in thoſe daies; and I appeale to the conſciences of your Brethren of the Scotch *Kirk*, if there be any pure Brother among them, that is not perſwaded, (tho he may be ſo wiſe as not to ſay it) that the *Scotch* did very well and like good Chriſtians, when they entred into England with the Bible in one hand, and the ſword in the other, for to aſſert Presbitery, againſt the kings deſign of eſtabliſhing Proteſtancy.

And, do not tell vs that theſe Doctors and Incendiaries were not Proteſtants, but Lutherans, Presbiterians and Calviniſts; for, firſt you have been ſo kind to them, and to all other Sectaries, as to ſay they all have one and the ſame faith profeſſed in the Church of England; this is their faith and Doctrin; you muſt not then deſown it; ſecondly, call them by what name you will; you haue one, and the ſelf ſame Rule of faith with them, *Scripture as each Perſon of ſound judgment in the Church interprets it*: this is the Rule of Proteſtancy as well as of Preſbitery and Lutheraniſm; put the caſe (and this is not any thing impoſſible) that a zealous

Proteſtant of ſound judgement, did interpret Scripture as Parſon *Peeters* and *Iudge Cook* did ; he will teach and act as they did ; and remain ſtill a true Proteſtant , and act nothing againſt the principles of Proteſtancy for he acts acording Scripture as he interprets it, and this is his Rule of faith.

Is it not confeſſedly your Proteſtant Doctrin , that Scripture alone as each Perſon of ſound judgment interprets it, is your Rule of faith ; that each Perſon is lycenc't by Scripture it ſelf to reade Scripture,to judge of the ſenſe of it, to hold and follow that ſenſe of it , which in his conſcience he thinks to be true ; that none is obliged to belieue any ſenſe of Scripture againſt his own judgment ; there is not a word in all this but the cream of Proteſtancie : take away the arbitrary interpretation of Scripture , and oblige men to follow and believe what ſenſe of it is propoſed to them by the Councils , King , ſtate Biſhops or Paſtors and down falls Proteſtancy , and the whole Reformation ; it's the ſpiritual birthright of any Proteſtant to believe and act as he vnderſtands Scripture ; which being true , as

Protestants must confess, its apparent; no Prince can have security of his kingdom or life in the Principles of Protestancy; for what hinders but that wee may have again in England, (as wee had Cromwell' in the year 40.) a bold ambitious Subject with a Parson *Peeters*, and Judge *Cook* of each side? the multitude is still capable of any impression; let them speake to the Multitude, that Popery has crept into the Protestant Church; that the lustre of the Ghospell is clouded with superstitious Rites and Ceremonies; that the Bishops and Ministers have degenerated from the purity of the Reformation; and all this they think to be true by Scripture as Presbiterians and Quakers do: what then if these Zelots did perswade the Multitude to demand a Reformation of these abuses; an extirpation of Popish-like Ceremonies; and if they could not get it by faire means, to rise in armes and get it by the edge of their swords, and perswade them not to be amused by king or state, Bishops or Ministers; that the birthright of a Protestant was, not to be constrained in their consciences, but

to have free liberty for to ſerve and worſhip God; not as others will preſcribe, but as wee think in our Conſcience the Scripture does warrant; and then would cite as many texts of Scripture as Parſon *Peeters*, *Calvin*, *Knox* and *Zuinglius* did, and vnderſtand them as they did (this has happen'd once, and why not again and again) that kings muſt be conſtrained by force of arms, if need be, to eſtabliſh the Reformation, to give libertie of Conſcience, to baniſh Popery and ſuperſtitions: what ſay you Dr in this caſe? heer is a multitude who are perſwaded by Scripture as they vnderſtand it, that your Church is ſuperſtitious and erroneous; they are perſwaded alſo by Scripture as they vnderſtand it, and as it is expounded to them by your beſt Doctors, that it is lawfull for them to take arms againſt their king for to reform your Church: can they raiſe arms or not? if not, then you muſt change your Rule of faith and deny that Principle, whervpon Proteſtancy and all the Reformation is cemented; *That it is lawfull for each one to believe, and act as he vnderſtands and interprets Scripture*; if you ſay it is

lawfull for him to raiſe arms againſt his king, becauſe he vnderſtands by Scripture that he is bound in this occaſion to do it? behold a Rebellion warranted by the Doctrin and Principles of your Reformation; and may be every year raiſed; for wee ſhall never want in a commonwealth, a giddie multitude, an ambitions ſpirit to head them for to fiſh in troubl'd waters, and deluded ſoules who miſvnderſtand the Word of God: and what aſſurance can there be of Subjects Loyaltie, or of the Princes ſafetie in ſuch Principles? This is vndoubtedly true, that an Arbitrarie interpretation of Scripture, and libertie for to believe what wee judge is the true meaning of it, is the eſſence and foundation not only of Proteſtancy but of all the Reformation: this is alſo no leſs certain, that wherever that Arbitrary interpretation is permitted, and libertie aſſumed for to believe what your own judgment ſuggeſts vnto you to be the ſenſe and meaning of Scripture, a Prince can never be ſure of the Obedience of his Subjects; for they can, at any time and often have, interpreted Scripture to his diſadvantage

vnder ſom fals pretext of piety and Religion : therefore its vndoubted that the Principles of Proteſtancie is not conſiſtent with the ſafetie of Soveraigns and obedience of Subjects.

No ſooner was this Arbitrary Interpretation of Scripture ſet vp , and libertie for belieuing what each one thought to be the true ſenſe of Scripture , but you dethroned the Pope ; Scripture as interpreted by you , was a ſufficient warrant to you for ſo doing; and I do not ſee why may not you make it a ſufficient warrant for to dethrone your Spiritual Head of England , as you did with Charles the firſt : and pretend you as much difference as you will, betwixt your ſelues and the Scotch *Kirk* , but in this you agree , that your Rule of faith is the ſame which they haue ; *Scripture as yee vndcrſtand it* ; neither are you more infallible in the Interpretation of it than they ; as therefore they judged by Scripture , that they ought not to receive that Vniformitie of Rites and Ceremonies , with the Church of England , and that ſubordinatiõ to Paſtors and Prelates, which king Charles the firſt endeauored to

bring them into ; and entred into England with a powerfull Army for to assert their Evangelical Libertie ; why may it not be allwaies feared that you may do the like when the Spirit moues you ?

Now let vs see if our Catholic Doctrin be so inconsistent with Loyaltie ; I say our *Doctrin*; for the sinister practices of som of our Church, is not to be imputed to the Church, but to their malice : all you can say of our Doctrin is, that wee believe Popes may absolve subjects of their allegiance to their Prince, and deprive him of his kingdom : and what Power do you grant to the Protestant Church ? Was it not the Protestant Church which excluded Queē Marie, the true Heires of the Crown, and raised the Lady Jean Grey to the throne ? was it not the Protestant Church representative in the Parliamēt, which excluded Queen Marie of Scotland and the family of the *Stuarts*, and substituted Queen Elizabeth ; and what for ? but to exclude Popery, and establish the Reformation ? was it not the Protestant Church representative in the Parliament, which deposed King Char-

les and ſubſtituted Cromwell; and was it not one of the chief cauſes againſt him that he was (as they apprehended) inclined to Popery?) thus you raiſe your Reformation vpon the ruin of the Popes, and fanaticiſm vpon the ruin of kings) and was it not the fear of the like effects from the ſame Principles of depoſing Princes not favorable to the Reformation, which obliged our prudent Stateſmen to make it a haynous crime, to ſay the king's a Papiſt or inclin'd to Popery? did all the Popes for 1600. years depoſe ſo many Princes in England, as your Reformation has in one age? or did England euer ſee in 6. ages of Popery, ſo many inſurrections, privat conſpiracies, ſuch frequent attempts, ſuch open Rebellions againſt Regal authority, as wee have ſeen in one age of Proteſtancy? what then do you talk to vs of the power of depoſing Princes in the Pope, when wee ſee a more illimitated power aſſumed by yourſelves, and ſo frequently exerciſed?

In our Catholic Doctrin only the Pope has that power, not of depoſing Princes, but of declaring them to be

ipſo

ipso facto depoſed as Divins ſay; in caſe they ſhould force their ſubjects to embrace his error; but in our Proteſtant Principles, ther's n'ere a Proteſtant in England but has it; for wheras you all have by the principles of your Religion, the libertie of reading and interpreting Scripture, and following with a ſafe conſcience what ſenſe of it you think to be true; if a Proteſtant judges by Scripture that Proteſtancy, as now it is profeſſed, has any mixture of Popery; if the ſpirit moves him to demand a reformation of the Church, he wants but a ſeaſonable occaſion and power for to aſk it of the King, and if he will not grant it; to oblige him by force of arms to do it: moreover this power of depoſing Princes belongs not to the Pope, as our Divins ſay, only becauſe the Prince is an Heretic, provided he does not pretend to force his ſubjects to his Error; and this being ſo, certainly our Doctrin is far leſs favorable to the Pope, than to ſecular Princes, for a Pope if he becoms an heretic, tho he never ſhould endeavor to pervert others, he is *ipso facto* depoſed from his Papacy. Finally if the

Popes power were ſo dangerous as our Adverſaries blow in their Proſelites eares, certainly Catholic Princes, who are as tender of their ſafetie and Authority as Proteſtants; would be more jealous of his ſupremacy than they are: and by the way let me advertiſe my Reader, how much our Adverſaries do injure the *French*, in ſaying they deny this power in the Pope; its moſt fals, for tho they may pretend by the Priviledges of the *Gallican* Church, to be exempted from that Power; but the Power they do not deny; but all diſputes of that point are ſeverely prohibited.

XIII. CHAPTER.

THE OATH OF SVPREMACIE VNLAWfull; and not needfull nor ſufficient for the ſecurity of our Princ's Intereſt.

THe Proteſtants themſelves who ſo vigorouſly preſs this oath vpon vs, more for hopes of getting the goods and imployments of them who refuſe it,

than for any devotion to their Religion or ſafetie of the king, are aſhamed to believe it lawfull in the genuin and natural ſignification of it; but do give it a far different ſenſe from that which the words of the Oath import, and their Acts of Parliament and Oath of Homage, exhibited by their Biſhops in their Conſecration, give it. For the Oath imports in the general apprehenſion of Proteſtants the kings ſupream ſpiritual ſupremacy in Eccleſiaſtical affairs, as wee believe it in the Pope; which implies a Power in the king (as in the Pope duely elected and conſecrated wee believe) for to conſecrat Biſhops and Prieſts, for to adminiſter the Sacraments, preach, and all other Eccleſiaſtical functions; for if the king be ſupream Head of the Church, as wee believe the Pope to be; it's from the king, as their ſpiritual Head, and the fountain of all Spiritual Juriſdiction, that the Biſhops and the reſt of theClergy, muſt derive their Character, their Juriſdiction, and their power for adminiſtring the Sacraments; and if they derive it from him, he muſt have it in himſelf; for none can give to an

other, that which he has not. That the king ſhould have any ſuch Power in himſelf, it appears ſo ridiculous to the Proteſtants themſelves to vtter it, that none will dare ſay it; and therefore they give other different ſenſes to the Oath, nor do they agree well among themſelves in what ſenſe it is to be vnderſtood; but when they tender the Oath to the people, and force them to take it, they never trouble themſelves to mollify it with any interpretation, but wee muſt take it, vnderſtand it as wee pleaſe.

That the true ſenſe and meaning of the Oath is to believe the ſpiritual ſupremacy of the king, as wee have declared it, and which the very Proteſtants themſelves this day judge to be ridiculous; it appears by the very Words of the Oath; and tho by crooked and far fetcht interpretations, ſom Doctors may give it a more myld and tolerable ſenſe, yet the Oath muſt be judged vnlawfull, becauſe the genuin, natural and common ſenſe of the words, is vnlawfull, and heterodox; ſecondly becauſe the ſenſe of the Oath intended by the Church of England which exacts it, is not that myld and paſſable ſenſe

which this or that privat Dr gives it; the Chnrch of England intends by that Oath to perſwade vs the Spiritual Supremacy and power of the king for to conſecrat Biſhops, give Spiritual Juriſdiction, authority and power for to adminiſter the Sacraments, and exerciſe other Eccleſiaſtical functions; and that this is the ſenſe intended in the Oath by the Church of England, it evidently appears; firſt, by their Statuts and Acts of Parliament which I cited in the *Introduction* to this Treatiſe, which I pray reade; ſecondly by the Oath of Homage which Proteſtant Biſhops take in their Conſecration, confeſſing that *they derive their Epiſcopal and Spiritual Juriſdiction wholy and ſolely from the king.* Thirdly I have proved in the Introduction that all the Spiritual Juriſdiction, and Epiſcopal Character your Church has, is derived from Queen Elizabeth: fourthly king Henry the VIII. who was the firſt that vſurped this ſupremacy, which now you pretend; made *Cromwell*, a Layman, his Vicar General in *Spiritualibus*, and exerciſed that office by the authority derived from him; and king James diſpenſed with ArchBiſhop

Abbots in the Irregularity he incurred by killing a man; laſtly if by that Oath the Church of England intended only an aſſurance of our Allegiance to our king, and intended nothing prejudicious to our faith, why would not they be content with an Oath of Allegiance worded without offence to our Conſciences: and it cannot be denied but that the Church of England intended by that Oath, wee ſhould acknowledge that ſupremacie to be in the king which wee Catholics do believe to be in the Pope, and thereby denie any Spiritual Supremacy in the Pope; it alſo intended wee ſhould believe that Supremacy to be in the king, which king Henry the VIII. aſſumed to himſelf; and this was no other than that ſupremacy as wee expounded, *for to Conſecrat, give power to others to conſecrat, inveſt* and *Confirm Biſhops, Adminiſter Sacraments*, &c.

Now that ſuch a ſupremacy cannot be attributed to any ſecular Prince, is a point ſo often, ſo ſolidly, and ſo largely proved by innumerable of our Authors, and not only the texts, and examples of Primitive Princes quoted by Dr Sall in his 17. Cap. but all that

the Proteſtant Writers have ſaid for themſelves in this point, ſo cleerly anſwered and refuted, that it would be a loſs of time to me and to my Reader to anſwer my Antagoniſts little trivial objections; and repeat again what has been ſo often ſaid, and is ſo knowen even to vulgar Readers; particularly that as I have ſaid, no Proteſtant of judgment will now pretend that kind of ſupremacy in the king: Calvin ſaies they were madmen who flattered the king of England ſo far as to raiſe him to that ſupremacy; Presbiterians, Anabaptiſts, Quakers, Independents, and the reſt of your ſectaries in England and out of England vtterly diſclaim it, and will not take that Oath; and only Roman Catholics are perſecuted, and puniſht with loſs of imployments, goods and eſtates for not taking it.

My Antagoniſt in his 17 Ch. brings ſom texts of S. Paul and ſom ſentences of S. Bernard, and S. Chryſoſtom to prove this ſupremacy; and whoever reades them in the places quoted by him, will plainly ſee, they only prove that wee ought to obey, and ſubmit to the heigher power and authority vnder

which wee are; and this none does or can deny; but what has that to do with our Controverſie? for thoſe paſſages quoted by my Adverſarie, do neither diſtinguiſh Powers (and my Dr I hope will not be ſo ſenſeleſs, as to deny there are ſeveral powers vnder which wee are, and to all which wee are obliged to obey) nor do they determin or declare, wherin thoſe diſtinct Powers are: there is no doubt but that wee are obliged to obey all Powers vnder which wee are, beccauſe all Power is conſtituted, derived and ordained by God; but if our Dr will be ſaid by S. Bernard. S. Chryſoſtom, S. Auguſtin and the ancient fathers, he will ſee in my next enſuing Chapter that the ſupream Spiritual Power, is in S. Peter and his ſucceſſors; and as he believes S. Bernard when he reprehends the disorders of the Roman Court, which he does in that 42. Epiſt. quoted by our Dr and in ſeveral other places, I hope he will believe him alſo when he ſaies, as wee ſhall ſee that the Pope is the ſupream Paſtor, Prince and chief of all the Biſhops: and my Reader will ſee in my enſuing Chapter, how much my Dr is to be blamed for diſ-

covering his ignorance, when he ſaies in his 15. Chapt. *that wee ſhall never find in Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorie any mention of any claim S. Peter ſhould have of any power ouer S. Iames in Ieruſalem, S. Andrew in Achaia or any other of the Apoſtles in their reſpective Provinces, and that none of thoſe More worthy firſt Biſhops of Rome for five hundred years did pretend to any ſupremacy.*

But before wee proceed to the proof of our Drs ignorance in this point, wee muſt ſee, if this Oath of ſupremacie be needfull, and ſufficient for our ſoveraigns ſafetie; not needfull, wheras wee ſee all other Soveraigns, as well Catholics as Proteſtants, judge themſelves ſecure without any ſuch Oath from their ſubjects: and when wee are ready to give to our Prince as much ſecurity of our fidelity, as any ſubjects of the world, give to their reſpective Soveraigns, why ſhould our conſciences be oppreſſed with an oath of ſupremacie repugnant to our faith; or our peace diſturbed by Remonſtrances and oaths againſt the Popes *indirect Temporal Power*, obtruded vpon vs by turbulent ſpirits; wheras ſuch Oaths are altogither needleſs for the ſecuring of ſubjects in their

Loyaltie, as will appeare by this diſcours: wherin I would have my Reader obſerve that I do not pretend to prove that any ſuch Power is in the Pope, as I let it paſs in my former Treatiſe, ſo I do now; but I intend to prove, that tho ſuch a Power were granted to be in the Pope, neither the Oath of ſupremacy, nor that Remonſtrance or Oath diſclaiming that indirect Temporal Power in the Pope aboue Princes, is needfull nor ſufficient to ſecure the ſubjects in their Obedience.

For ſuppoſe there is ſuch a Power in the Pope; where leyes the danger to the Prince who has the affection of his ſubjects? in the exerciſe of that Power, you will ſay, if the Pope ſhould abſolve vs from our Allegiance, and command vs vnder pain of Excommunication not to obey him, and to ryſe in arms againſt him: but I will demonſtrat, its a caſe *Morally* impoſſible, and a *Metaphiſical* caſe, as the ſchools ſpeake, that ſubjects may be obliged to obey any ſuch command or feare any ſuch Excommunications, but may lawfully and conſcientiouſly reſiſt, and pay their Obedience to their Soveraign; for its a

Principle vnanimouſly received by Moral Divins, that no Eccleſiaſtical precept obliges in conſcience, if in ſaid Obedience wee hazard our life, our fortunes, or our honor; for example the Church commands vs to faſt in Lent; you are ſick; you cannot faſt without a notable prejudice to your health; you are not obliged; the Church commands you to hear Maſs on ſundaies; you cannot without hazarding your life becauſe you are ſick; without hazarding your eſtate by reaſon of a Perſecution; you are not obliged: Now, the Pop's command and excommunication againſt our Obedience to our Prince, is but an Etcleſiaſtical Precept at moſt; therefore it cannot oblige ſubjects with the hazard of their lyves, fortunes, or honor; but it is morally impoſſible but that they ſhould hazard all three, if they ſhould deny Obedience and reſiſt their Soveraign; for ſuch a diſobedience or inſurrection muſt caſt them into a warr, or a moſt evident danger of a warr, where all is expoſed, therefore it's a *Metaphiſical* caſe and *Morally* impoſſible that ſubjects can be obliged by any command or cenſure of the

Pope to deny obedience to their Prince: Say then what you pleaſe of that *Power*; many learned Diuins convincingly prove, it annoyes not the ſafetie of Princes; the very Heterodox Soveraigns do not care for it: nor are yee who take it eſteemed better Subjects, than they who refuſe it.

But you reply; tho Subjects be not *obliged* to obey ſuch Commands and Cenſures of the Pope, yet they may lawfully obey them; and ſo the Prince muſt depend of the Subjects courteſie; for being lycenc't once by the Pope, nothing is wanting to the execution but their Will and pleaſure:

To this our Divins do commonly anſwer, that for to ſecure Subjects that they *May not*, the way is not to force vpon them an *Oath* diſavowing the Power in the Pope; but an *Oath* of never cõcurring to the exerciſe of that Power, if any he had; that's to ſay, of never takeing arms, or denying Obedience to their Prince vpon any command or Cenſure of the Pope: which Oath, as it does not affirm or deny any Power in the Pope (let the Divins diſpute it out) ſo it rids Conſciences from Scruples of

ſwearing, what they do not know to be true or fals; and ſecures them from any *Fact*, or exerciſe of it prejudicious to their Prince; which, and the many ſignal teſtimonies of the Loyaltie of his Catholic Subjects; and their willingneſs to give his Majeſtie any pledge of their fidelitie which does not ſhock their conſciences, would abundantly ſatisfie our clement Prince and prudent ſtateſmen, if ſome ouer-buſy ſpirits did not trouble our reſt; which trouble the Iriſh indeed did ſuffer, as the Dr ſaies in his 16. Chap. not from his Majeſty, nor from his Grace his Lieutenant, (who moſt judiciouſly approved the ſatisfactiõ which was offered him by Perſons of knowen loyaltie, honor and learning in a conference had with them, Mr Peter Walſh being preſent) but from ſom who were too too officious and vnreaſonable in preſſing Oaths vpon Catholic and Iriſh ſubjects, as if for being Catholics and Iriſh wee muſt be ſuſpected aboue all others of diſloyaltie: but ſay you again, if ſuch a *Power* be granted in the Pope; he may declare a Prince depoſed, and expoſe his kingdom to any forreign Prince who is pleaſed to invade it? I anſwer: if that ſhould be; how can any Oath

whatsoever of subjects hinder that a forreignPrince shall not invade ourPrince? is it because wee sweare the Pope has no such Power, that the forreignPrince will desist from invading, if the fancie takes him? what ourDivins pretend, is to shew, that the Oath of supremacie is needless to secure Subjects in their Loyaltie.

Now I will shew that as that Oath of supremacy is needless, so it is not sufficiēt to secure Subjects in their Loyaltie; and this I will shew in thePrinciples and practice of theChurch of Englād andDr Sall: Our Dr has made a Solemn Vow or Oath of Povertie obliging himself never to have any Rents or revenews; also a Solemn Vow of never pretending or accepting any Eccleſiasticall Dignitie; he made other Vows of Chastitie, Obediēce &c. Now he saies, those Vows or Oaths do not oblige him: and why? because saies he pag. 181. aginst N. N. *I made a former Vow of Religious Obedience in my Baptism to God; if I find the later Vow made to the Pope, not to consist with the compliance of the former made to God, then I must stand to the former made to God, and rescind the later made to the Pope.* And just so may any Protestant, or Child of the Reformation say, after taking the Oath of

ſupremacy: for as wee proved in our 12. Chapt. their Rule of faith being Scripture *as each Perſon of ſound judgment vnderſtands it*; after ſwearing the Oath of Supremacy, if you reade and ſtudie the Scripture, and the Spirit, or your ignorance moves you to vnderſtand by the text, that the Rites, Ceremonies and practices of the Proteſtant Church are degenerated into Popery,) as Preſbiterians, Anabaptiſts, and Quakers judge) and you paſs further, and meet ſom texts as Zuinglius, Calvin, Parſon Peeters, and Beza did, and interpret them, that you ought to demand a Reformation of thoſe abuſes, and in caſe of a repuls, to raiſe arms againſt the king and force him to it; then you will ſay that in your Baptiſm you made a vow of Obedience and Religion to God, according his Word; that your Oath of ſupremacy does not conſiſt with the compliance of this former; and that you muſt reſcind the later and ſtand to the former; what then does your Oath of ſupremacy ſignifie in the Proteſtant Religion?

Laſtly this Oath is not advantagious, but deſtructive to the Government; for

it being made the *diſtinctive ſign* of Loyaltie, and none being admitted to the king's Service in Civil or military imployments, but ſuch as will take it; his Majeſtie is deprived of many ſtout and gallant ſubjects who are not permitted to ſerve him, becauſe they will not ſtrain their Conſciences with an Oath: And beſides the offices of truſt in the kingdom being open to thoſe who are ready to take an oath, and there being men in all times and commonwealths who wil never ſtick to take an oath, for to advance their fortune; the places of truſt will com to the hands of thoſe proſtituted conſciences; who, as they ſold their faith for their intereſt, will betray their truſt and king when any good bargain preſents: and who does not ſee how deſtructive this is to the government? Innumerable experiences ſhew vs, particularly ſince the year 40. who were the more faithfull to the king; the Catholics who refuſed the Oath, but never drew ſword againſt him; or the Proteſtants who freely tooke it, and fought againſt him.

XIV.

XIV. CHAPTER.

THE POPES SVPREMACY ASSERTED.

ALl the combuſtions and diſmal contentions of our kingdoms for a whole age did proceed from the Pop's pretenſion to ſupremacie, ſaies our Dr: All Dr? The combuſtions of England, when *Dudley* Duke of Northumberland beheaded *Seamor* the Protector; poyſoned the yong king; rayſed the Lady *Iean Grey* to the throne; and married her to his ſon; was all this (and the Tragical circumſtances which acompanied it) becauſe the Pope did pretend to ſupremacie? or was it not rather an effect of Proteſtancie which *Dudley* endeavored to eſtabliſh, for to raiſe his family vpon the oppreſſion of the true Monarch? Was the Murther of king James in Scotland, and the violence of her ſubjects againſt Queen Marie? was the impriſonment and death of that Queen by Queen Elizabeth; becauſe the Pope pretended to ſupremacie? or was it not

an effect of Queen Elizabeth's ambition of securing herself in the Crown, and excluding the family of the *Stuarts?* was it because the Pope would be head of the Church, that the Parliament rebelled the year 40. against the king? *It was not any alteration of Ceremonies, or language in Divin Service* (saies he) *which minister'd fewell to this fatal fire, all would have been granted by the Pope if wee did own his supremacie*; and not one word of proof of all these hallucinations, but that one *Twisden* (a *chimæra* for ought the world knows) should have said the Pope offered to condescend with Queen Elizabeth in all points of the Reformation, if she did but own his supremacie, to which, see my answer in the *Introduction.*

He pursues his invective against the Pop's supremacie and tells vs *S. Gregorie* detested and disclaimed the Title of *Vniversall Bishop*, which he saies, is a commendation of his Modestie, and a check of the vnlimited ambition of the Popes of Rome. Its true S.Gregorie, lib. 4.Epist. 32.34. 36. and 38. writes against that name of *Vniversall Bishop*, but not in his 4th. book, 60. and 67. Epist. as my

Adverſarie cites, for that book has but 57. Epiſtles; and what S. Gregorie condemns is not the name, but the ſenſe and meaning, in which John that ambitious Patriarck of Conſtantinople vſurped it: for it may have two meanings; the one is, the Chief and firſt Biſhop, ſupream in Power and Juriſdiction, Chief Governor of the Church; in this ſenſe S. Gregorie did not condemn it: the ſecond meaning of that name is, to be the Univerſal Biſhop of the Church, that's to ſay the only Biſhop of the Church; ſo as that the reſt of the Biſhops are not properly Biſhops, but adminiſtrators or Vicars vnder him: In this ſenſe did *John* the Patriark of Conſtantinople aſſume that name, and S. Gregorie did check his ambition, as appears in his 7th. book Epiſt. 71. *Hoc in totius Eccleſiæ injuriam & omnium, &c. In this he injures the whole Church, and deſpiſes you all, for if one be the Vniverſal Biſhop, as he vnderſtands it, then none of you all is a Biſhop.* Again l. 4. Epiſt 38. *Deſpectis fratribus, appetit ſolus Epiſcopus vocari: Deſpiſing his Brethren he ambitions to be called the only Biſhop.* You know very well Dr that the Pope does

not pretend to be called, and that wee do not call him Universal Bishop in this sense, as if he did pretend to be, or wee should be so senseless as to say, he is the only Bishop in the Church; and the rest of the Bishops are not truly and properly Bishops.

But in the sense that the Pope assumes that name, that's to say to be the chief Bishop in power and Jurisdiction aboue the rest, the supream Governor of the Church, S Gregorie did never blame, nor condemn it; nay l. 7. Epist. 65. speaking of the Sea of Rome he saies, *In saying he is subject to the Sea of Rome, I know no Bishop but is subject to it*, and S. Leo Epist. 48. calls the Chair of Peter, *the Seate of the Vniversal Church*; and S. Gregorie l. 4. Epist. 32. saies, and Dr Sall confesses, that the name of Universal Bishop was offered by the Council of Chalcedon Act. 3. and Act. 16. to Leo Pope; this was one of the four first General Councils, which our Dr reveres for a Holy and sacred Council; and must consequently confess, that that name of Universal Bishop, which it offered to Leo, was Orthodox and lawfull; or that the Concil erred

foully and irreligiouſly in offering it: Its true as S Gregorie ſaies. The Popes before him did not aſſume, but refuſe and deteſt that name, but that was becauſe it was an odious name, by reaſon of the ſenſe in which John the Patriark, and others did aſſume it; therefore they would not vſe it: not becauſe it was not juſt and lawfull in the true ſenſe meaned by the Church.

And if wee can prove that S. Peter was the chief in power and authoritie aboue the Apoſtles, the ſupream in Juriſdiction; ther's no difficultie in believing that his Succeſſors are the chief and ſupream in Power and Authority aboue the other Biſhops. Our Dr ſaies pag. 31. he does not read that Peter ſhould have any Authority aboue Andrew in Achaia, or Thomas in the Indies, or the other Apoſtles in their reſpective Provinces and this proves no more, but that either his Librarie is ill furniſht with books, or that he does not ſtudie, nay nor reade carefully the Bible: of all the Texts it affords, I will produce but three with the gloſſes of ſom fathers vpon them.

In two ſeveral occaſions, Chriſt

ſpeakes particularly of the power he was to give the Apoſtles for to tye and vntye: the firſt, Math 16. he ſpeakes to Peter alone, *tibi dabo claves regni cælorum, quodcunque ligaveris ſuper terram, erit ligatum & in cælis, quodcunque ſolveris ſuper terram, erit ſolutum & in cælis. To thee I will give the keyes of the kingdom of the Heavens; whatſoever you ſhall bind on earth ſhall be bound in the Heavens; whatſoever you ſhall vnbind on earth ſhall be vnbound in the Heavens.* Again ſpeaking of this power he was to give to his Apoſtles, Math. 18. he ſaies, *whatever yee ſhall bind on earth ſhall be bound in Heaven, and whatever yee ſhall vnbind on earth, ſhall be vnbound in Heaven*: Origen Hom. 6. in Math. obſerves the great difference expreſſed in this text betwixt Peter and the reſt of the Apoſtles. *Non modica differentia eſt, quod Petro datæ ſunt claves non vnius cæli, ſed multorum cælorum; & quæ ligata ſunt ſuper terram, eſſent ligata non in vno tantum cælo, ſed in omnibus cælis; ad eos autem qui multi ſunt ligatores & ſolutores in terra, ſic dicit vt ſoluant & alligent, non in cælis, ſicut Petrus, ſed in vno cælo, quia non ſunt in tanta perfectione ſicut Petrus, vt alligent &*

ſoluant in omnibus cælis. It's no ſmale difference that to Peter are given the keyes, *not of one heaven but of many, and that what is bound on earth* (by him) *ſhould be bound not in one heaven, but in all the heavens. But to the reſt,* who *are binders and vnbinders on earth he ſaies, that they can tye or vntye, not in all the heavens as Peter, but in one heaven; becauſe they have not that power that Peter to tye and vntye in all the heavens.* For the cleerer vnderſtanding of this paſſage, S. Gregorie tells vs Hom. 12. in Evang. *Per regnum cælorum in ſacro eloquio præſentis temporis Eccleſia deſignatur: by the* k*ingdom of the Heavens, is vnderſtood in Scripture this militant Church on earth.* Its a k*ingdom*, compoſed of *many heavens*, that's to ſay, *many Churches*: now Origen's obſervation cleerly convinces Peter's ſupremacie for he had the Power of tying and vntying in *all the Heavens*; that's to ſay in all the Churches, his Juriſdiction reached to *all*; each of the other Apoſtles had a power of binding and vnbinding *in vno cælo tantum*, in *one heaven*, only, in *one Church* but not in *all*: S. Hierom and S. Auguſtin obſerved that when Chriſt ſpeakes to S. Peter and gives him the

Power Math. 16. he gives him the Keyes, *tibi dabo claves*; but when he gives the Power to all the Apoſtles Math. 18. no keyes are mentioned, *Soli Petro*, ſaies S. Aug. in Pſ. 108. *dictum eſt, tibi dabo claves*, &c. *quia figuram gerebat Eccleſiæ, propter primatum Apoſtolatus, totius Eccleſiæ gerebat Perſonam: to Peter alone it was ſaid to thee I will give the keyes &c. becauſe he repreſented the Church; for the primacy of his Apoſtleship he repreſented the* whole Church, It's very true all the Apoſtles and the whole Church received the Keyes, ſaies S. Hierom, l. cont. Jouin. *Cuncti Apoſtoli Claves acceperunt*; but ſaies S. Auguſt. tract. 24 in Joan. *Tota Eccleſia accepit in Petro*, they all received the keyes in Peter, as being the chief and Prince of all; they all have the Power of *tying* and *vntying*, but they muſt call to Peter for the Keyes.

The ſecond Text Luc. 5. *Duc in altum & laxate retia; Lanch out into the Deep, and let your nets drop for a draught.* S. Ambroſe obſerves *Soli Petro dicitur, Duc; omnibus imperatur vt laxent retia: to Peter only it's ſaid lanch out and lead the boat; all are commanded to drop the nets*: all muſt work and labor, Peter alone muſt go-

vern the boat: hence it is, that S. Hierom having ſaid l. cont. Jouin. *Super omnes Apoſtolos ex æquo fortitudo Eccleſiæ ſolidatur; that the ſtrength of the Church is equally founded vpon all the Apoſtles*; he ads immediatly in the ſame place(which our Adverſaries fraudulently let paſs in ſylence) *Tamen inter duodecem Vnus eligitur, vt Capite conſtituto ſchiſmatis tolleretur occaſio; but among the twelve one is choſen, that a Head and chief being appointed, all ocaſion of ſchiſm might be avoided:* and that you might not ſuſpect that Peter was ordained the Head and Chief, only of the reſt of the Church, but not of the Apoſtles; hear S. Greg. l. 4. Epiſt. 38. *Certe Petrus Apoſtolus primum membrum Vniverſalis Eccleſiæ eſt; Paulus, Andreas, Ioannes, quid aliud, niſi ſingularium plebium capita ſunt, & tamen ſub vno capite* (ſcilicet Petro) *omnes membra ſunt Eccleſiæ. Trulie Peter is the chief member of the Church Vniverſal, Paul, Andrew, John, what are they, but heads of particular flocks, and they are all but members of the Church, vnder one head*, which head is S. Peter, ſaies S. Greg. again l. 4. Epiſt. 32. *Omnium Apoſtolorũ Principi Petro Vniverſalis Eccleſiæ cura commiſſa eſt; Peter, the Prince of the*

Apoſtles to whom the care of the Vniverſal Church was committed. Alſo S. Cyprian. l. de Unit. Eccl. having ſaid, *Omnes Apoſtoli pari conſortio præditi ſunt & honoris & dignitatis: the Apoſtles were equallie endowed with power and honor*; he added immediatly (which our Adverſaries alſo diſingenuouſly omit) *ſed exordium ab Vnitate proficiſcitur, Petro Primatus datur, vt vna Chriſti Eccleſia & vna Cathedra monſtretur; but the beginning ſprings from Vnitie, the Primacy is given to Peter, to denote the Vnitie of Chriſts Church, and the Vnitie of the Chaire*, and S. Cyprian himſelf ſaies, as wee'l ſee immediatly, that by denying this Unitie and Primacy, wee run into hereſies and ſchiſms.

The third Text Luc. 22. *I have praied for thee Peter, that they faith may not faile, and you being converted, confirm they Brethren.* He gawe Peter the charge of ſtrengthning his Brethren in their temptations, and hence Theophil. commenting vpon this text concludes that he made him the Chief head of the Apoſtles; *Manifeſtus Verborum ſenſus eſt, quod cum te diſcipulorum Principem fecerim tu eum poſt negationem fleveris & reſipueris, confirma fratres tuos; hoc te decet qui poſt me*

Eccleſiæ Petra & fundamentum es. The ſenſe of the text (ſaies he) *is cleer*; that wheras *I made you Prince of the Diſciples, when you have lamented your Denial, ſtrengthen your Brethren*; *this becoms you, who are after me, the Rock and fundation of the Church.* S. Auguſtin is no leſs expreſs in his gloſs vpon that text, Serm. 124 de Tem. *Totius corporis morbum in ipſo Capite curat Eccleſiæ; in ipſo componit omnium membrorum ſanitatem. He heales the diſeaſe of the whole in the very head of the Church; in him he places the health of all the members*: Behold how diſtinctly he calls him the *Head* of the whole Church; and admire the bad luck of our good Dr that he could not meet, he ſaies, any mention in the Primitive fathers of the firſt fiue hnndred years of Peters ſupremacy ouer Andrew in *Achaia*, Thomas in *Indies*, or the reſt of the Apoſtles: if but now, that wee have furniſht him with theſe paſſages, he did open his eyes to the light of Truth; if he did reade Chryſoſt. *Hom.* 55. *in Math.* he would find Peter called the Top of the Apoſtolical Colledge; and again hom. 87. in Joan. *Petrus os eſt Apoſtolorum, totius cœtus vertex, & Magiſter Orbis, qui Iacobum Hieroſolimis præ-*

posuit. Peter is the Mouth of the Apostles, the Top of the Apostolical Colledge, the Master of the world who made Iames Bishop of Ierusalem; and again, hom. 3. in Act. commending Peter's modestie, that tho he was the chief and superior of the Apostles, yet he would not alone, without the approbation and consent of the rest, chuse *Mathias* to the Apostleship, *quid*, saies he, *an non licebat illi soli eligere? licebat quidem; & maxime licebat; verum id non fecit; nihil authoritate sola, nihil cum imperio. Could not he alone chuse Mathias? yes he could; but he would not; nothing by his proper Authority; nothing by command*; let our Dr read *Optatus* l. 2. cont. *Parmenianum. Omnium Apostolorum Caput Petrus Romæ Sedit, vt in illa vna Cathedra, vnitas ab omnibus servaretur, ne cæteri Apostoli singulas Cathedras sibi quisque defenderet. Peter the head of all the Apostles, sits at Rome, that in that one Chaire, Vnitie should be kept by all; least that each of the rest of the Apostles, should claim each of their chaires proper to themselves*, without any subordination to their head. And because our Dr flatters himself with the perswasion of S. Bernard's judgment against S. Peter's Supremacie,

let him reade the Saint l. 2. de Consid. ad Eug. *Tu quis es? Summus Sacerdos, Pontifex magnus, tu Princeps Episcoporum, tu hæres Apostolorum, tu primatu Abel, gubernatu Noe, Patriarchatu Abraham, ordine Melchisedech, dignitate Aaron, Authoritate Moyses, Iudicatu Samüel, Potestate Petrus, Vnctione Christus: tu es cui claves traditæ, cui oues creditæ sunt; sunt quidem & alij cœli Ianitores & gregum Pastores, sed tu tanto glorioſius, quanto differentius, vtrumque præ cæteris nomen hæreditasti: habent illi sibi assignatos greges, singuli singulos, tibi Vniversi crediti, Vni Vnus; nec modo ovium, sed & pastorum tu vnus omnium, Pastor.* Who are you? (saies S. Bernard to Eugenius Pope) *You are the great Priest; the Heigh Bishop, the Prince of Bishops, the heire of the Apostles, by Primacy Abel, by government Noe, by Patriarchship Abraham, by Order Melchisedech, by Dignitie Aaron, by Authoritie Moyses, by Iudicature Samuel, by Power Peter, by Vnction Christ: to you the keyes were given, to you the sheep were committed: here are also other Porters of Heaven and Pastors of the flock; but you with so much the more excellencie, by how much the more differently aboue all others you possess those names: they have their flocks apointed for*

them; each one his own particular flock; to thee all are delivered, one flock to one; nor are you only the Paſtor of the ſheep, but you are the only and ſole Paſtor of all the Paſtors: and a little beneath; *Aliorum poteſtas certis arctatur limitibus, tua extenditur & in ipſos qui poteſtatem ſuper alios acceperunt. The power of others is confin'd within certain bonds, but your power reachs ouer thoſe who have power aboue others.*

And that nothing may be wanting for a full conviction of this truth, hear S. Hierom in Dial. ad Lucif. proving the neceſſitie of this Papal Supremacie; *Niſi ſupereminens quædam, &c. if there be not a ſupereminent and ſupream authoritie in the Church, there will be as many ſchiſms in the Church, as there are Prieſts:* and tho you may attribut that confuſed diſtraction of ſectaries in England and elſwhere to other cauſes; but S. Cyprian l. 1. Epiſt. 30. gives you the genuin reaſon of it; *Non aliunde natæ ſunt hæreſes, aut ortæ ſchiſmata, quam quia non agnoſcunt vnum Vice-Chriſti ad tempus Iudicem, cui Vniverſa fraternitas obtemperet. Hereſies and ſchiſms, have no other ſource, but becauſe they do not acknowledge one Iudge Vicegerent of Chriſt to which all the flock ſhould obey.* Judge

you now Reader with what truth our Dr ſaies that no mention is made by antiquitie of S. Peters ſupremacy which has been ſo cleerly delivered as I have ſhowen, by Origen, Cyprian, S. Auguſt. Ambroſe, Hierom, Chryſoſtom, Bernard, Theofilact, and Optatus; and to whoſe judgment will you ſtick, either of ſuch Oracles who teach Peter's ſupremacie, or of a Luther, a Calvin, a Beza, who to live without curb, rebell'd againſt Authoritie; ſee which you will prefer; or the vnanimous conſent of ages vpward to the Apoſtles; or this our laſt age diſtracted by Muſhrom ſectaries; ſee with whom you will believe; with the Vniverſities and innumerable Drs and fathers of the paſt and this preſent age, or with a handfull of obſcure and vnknowen people.

XV. CHAPTER.

MY SYLLOGISMS FOR TRANSVBSTANtiation enforced againſt the Doctor and the Doctrin proved againſt his ſenſe and Reaſon.

I propoſed a ſyllogiſm in my former Treatiſe pag. 188. for our Tenet of Tranſubſtantiation, grounded vpon the text of S. Luke 22. *Take eat this is my body which is given for you*: the text denotes, he gave to them ſomwhat to eate; I proved it was his reall Body; for; Hegave *to* them to eate, what he gave *for* them; the Text ſaies it, *take eat this is my body which is given for you*; but he gave *for* them his real body; therefore he gave *to* them his Real body: for as I advertis'd, the Text makes no difference betwixt what he gave *To* them, and what he gave *for* them: by what principles then muſt we interpret the text, and ſay that what he gave *to* them was a figure only, and what he gave for them was his Real body?

body? will it not be as lawfull to *Marcion* to interpret the text as to you, and ſay that as the text in the firſt part imports only a figurative body given *to* them; ſo in the ſecond part it imports but a figurative body given *for* them.

His anſwer is that my argument *is not worth a ruſh; that with a peece of his Logic he will prove it a paralogiſm*; and raiſes ſuch a thick miſt of ſcholaſtical terms ſo often repeated in few lynes, that I defy you read his diſcours and your head not to ake: after a great deal of tittle tattle againſt the *form* of my ſyllogiſm; the vpſhot of his anſwer is, that tho the text does not diſtinguiſh betwixt what Chriſt gave *To* vs in the ſupper, and what he gave *for* vs yet our eyes do diſtinguiſh betwixt both, for we ſee what he gave to vs, was but *Bread*, and what he gave for vs on the Croſs was an Organic Body. This anſwer I did forſee and replied againſt it in my former Treatiſe; but not a ſyllable does my Antagoniſt anſwer againſt my replies, as if I had made none.

But its well he has attempted to ſay ſomwhat; he confeſſes plainly the text makes no difference betwixt what

he gave to his disciples in the supper and what he was to give for them vpon the cross; our eyes he saies distinguish betwixt both; because they did see but bread in the supper; and they did see an Organic body, vpon the cross. Very well: I pray Dr, the night that Christ was at the supper, when he took the bread and vttered those words, *take eat, this is my Body which is given for you.* Did the Apostles see with their eyes that night Christ's *Organic Body* given for vs vpon the cross! No, for he was not then crucified: What did they believe then, that Christ would give *To* them to eate? the figure only of his Body saies our Dr, real bread; because their eyes did see but bread: and what did they believe then, that Christ would give *for* them on the cross? an *Organic Body* saies he; why so? for the text as you confess, makes no distinction betwixt what he gave *To* them, and *For* them; our eyes you say make the distinction; then, in the night of the supper their eyes did not see his Organic Body on the cross; how could they therefore distinguish then, what he gave *to* them to eate, from that he was to give *for*

them on the croſs; O but ſay you, the next day after they did ſee his Organic Body *for* them vpon the croſs: its true; but I ſpeake of the ſupper the night before; then, as they believed that Chriſt's Body was given *To* them, becauſe Chriſt ſaid, *take eat* ſo they believed at the ſame time his body would be given *for* them on the croſs, becauſe he ſaid in the ſame text, which is given *for* you; and my difficultie is, ſince they did believe that the bodie given *to* them, was only a figurative body, by what Principle did they diſtinguiſh that the body which would be given for them was an Organic Body? for by virtue of the text, as you confeſs, they could not Diſtinguiſh there two different bodies; nor by their eyes, becauſe they did not ſee the Organic Body on the croſs.

The like may be ſaid of Abraham, Iſaac, and the ancient Patriarks; they believed that Chriſt would give his Body *to* vs in the ſupper, and *for* vs on the croſs; doubtleſs theſe Miſteries were revealed to them: did they believe it was a figurative only body was given *to* vs in the ſupper, and an Organic real body on the croſs? by

what principle did they make this distinction of what was given *To* vs, from what was given *for* vs? not by any text or supernatural revelation; for sure you will not say he spoke to them of the Ancient law in more expres and emphatic terms, than to those of the law of Grace; nor by their eyes or senses, for they did not see Christ in the supper, nor on the cros: you must conclude then, that either they believed his figurative only Body was to be in the supper and on the cros; or that his true real and substantial Body was to be in both.

It's a gallant resolution of our Dr in his pag. 116. Sr saies he, *wee are ready to captivat our senses and reason to faith in God whereseever we find him to declare his will vnto vs, without any further examin:* but hang the *Good town of Swords*, whose Parish makes him break this resolution: I pray Dr answer me to a question I proposed to you pag. 144. of the *Vnerring Vnerrable Church*, which you dropt vnder the table like a naughtie card; but I'l tak it vp: Can you deny but that God might, if he were pleased, turn the substance of the bread into

his fleſh and blood, and give vs his true and real Body vnder the accidents of bread? as he turned the Water into wine, and as our ſtomack turns the Victuals we eat into our fleſh and blood? you will not deny, but that he might, if he were pleaſed: If Chriſt were really intended to do it; and to give vs his real true body vnder the accidents of bread, how could he declare his intention in cleerer expreſſions than taking bread, and ſaying, *take eat this is my body, truly my fleſh*; what cleerer expreſſion can any man expect in a ſerious converſation betwixt honeſt men? He ſpoke then, as if really he intended to give vs his real body vnder the accidents of bread; for if he had really intended it, he could not ſpeak otherwiſe: Can you then doubt, but that Gods Will is ſufficiently declared vnto you in this point? and yet you will not captivat your ſenſes nor reaſon; you will not, notwithſtanding the plain and cleer ſenſe of Gods Word, believe it's his true body, becauſe your eyes and taſt find its bread; and is not this to captivat Gods Word to your ſenſes rather than to captivat your ſenſes to

his Word; when you contradict the plain natural ſenſe of his Words, becauſe your ſenſes and reaſon contradict it?

Let vs hear how far is the Dr from the faith of the Ancient Fathers of the Church, and from their ſubmiſſion to Gods word in this ineffable miſterie: S Chryſoſt. ſpeakes thus Hom. 60. ad Pop. Ant. *Let vs obey God in all things, and not gainſay him, tho what he ſaies contradicts our ſenſes and imaginations; let his Word obtain more credit from vs, than our thoughts and ſight: let vs not conſider only what leyes before our eyes, but hold faſt to his Word; for his Words are infallible and our ſenſes are eaſie to be deceived: his words never faile, but our ſenſes frequentlie miſtake; becauſe therefore he ſaies, this is my Body, let vs obey believe and behold him with the eyes of our Vnderſtanding.* And again in the ſame place; *What Paſtor feeds his flock with his own blood? but he feeds vs with his own proper blood.* S. Cyril is no leſs expreſs in excluding our ſenſes from being Judges in this Miſterie Orat. 4. Cath. *do not look on this as naked bread, for it is the Body and blood of Chriſt himſelf, and although ſenſe does ſuggeſt vnto thee that this is bread, yet let faith confirm thee: do not*

judge of it by they taſt, but know and hold for certain, that this bread which is ſeen of vs, is no bread, though the taſt iudges it to be bread, but the body of Chriſt; and the wine which ſeemes to our taſt to be wine, is no wine but the blood of Chriſt. S. Epiph. in Acor. circa Medium ſpeakes of this Miſterie, *Wee ſee its neither equal, nor like in proportion to his flesh, but yet becauſe he was pleaſed to ſay through grace, this is my flesh, every one believeth, notwithſtanding what wee ſee, for his ſaying; and everie one who believeth not, it is his very true Body, falleth from Grace.* Thus the ancient fathers captivated their ſenſes to faith, notwihſtanding the evidence of their eyes: And not only the example of the Fathers, but ſeveral paſſages of Scripture manifeſtly prove, that we muſt believe the plain and natural ſenſe of the word of God, againſt the evidence of our eyes; as S. Joſeph believed his Spouſe the B. Virgin to be a Virgin vpon the teſtimonie of the Angel, againſt the evidence of his eyes, which did ſee in her the marks of a Woman. Tobias alſo did ſee in his fellow Traveller but the Accidents of a human nature, yet againſt the evidence of his

ſenſe which did ſee nothing but a man; he believed him to be a Spirit: ſo alſo tho our eyes ſee nothing but bread in the conſecrated Hoſt, yet we believe againſt the evidence of ſenſe, that it is no bread but the Body of Chriſt, becauſe the words of Chriſt, *This is my Body*, is of a more infallible aſſurance than our eyes and other ſenſes.

But ſaies our Dr this Miſterie is quite repugnant to human reaſon; becauſe thence it would follow, that Chriſt's Bodie would be at one time in as many different places, as there are conſecrated hoſts; and reaſon ſhews a Body cannot be at one time, but in one place. If he had read carefully S. Paul's 1. Epiſtle to the Corint. chap 15. this difficultie would not have ſtartl'd him: there the Apoſtle diſtinguiſhes two kind of Bodies (or rather one and the ſame body in two different ſtates and conditions) a ſpiritual, and an earthly natural body, which two bodies are not ſubſtantially different, or two different ſubſtances, but one and the ſame body vnder different qualities and accidents; for he ſaies, this our naturall corruptible Body ſhall be changed in the Re-

ſurrection of the dead, into a ſpiritual body that's to ſay purified from earthly qualities; it ſhall be ſpiritualiſed, and becom immortal, impaſſible and adorned with ſpiritual qualities. Our Dr knows well that a ſpiritual ſubſtance can be in many places, and ſomtimes in a ſmal ſpace, ſomtimes in a greater, as our ſoule is wholy in each part of our Body: allow therefore (which is fals) that this our earthly corruptible body may not be in many places, but when it is ſpiritualiſed and has changed its earthly natural qualities into ſpiritual qualities, and becom as it were a ſpiritual, immortal impaſſible incorruptible ſubſtance, as glorious bodies are, why may it not have that qualitie and capacitie, as ſpirits have, of being in many places; and being ſomtime in a great, ſomtime in a ſmale place: and therefore we ſay that Chriſt's bodie by virtue of its ſpiritual qualities, becauſe it's ſpiritualized as glorious bodies are, may be in many places; even as the Body of Chriſt entred into the Cenacle the doores being ſhut, whether that was by the chinks of the doore or the keye hole, or penetrating the door; this is

no leſs repugnant to reaſon, and to the exigence of a natural earthly Maſſive Body, than to be in many places; and how did that happen? S. Epiph anſwers Hær. 64. *Our Saviour riſed from the dead, not taking an other body, but the ſelf ſame body, which he had, changing it into a ſpiritual ſubtilitie, or ſpiritualizing it, by which he entred the door being ſhut. He who entred,* ſaies S. Ambroſe l. 10. c. 24 in Luc. *had a true real body; how then did he enter the door being ſhut? by the qualities of a ſpirit which he received in his Reſurrection; the body is ſowen a natural, corruptible, earthly body; it riſeth a ſpiritual, heavenly incorruptible one.* By theſe Principles of Scripture and conſent of ancient Fathers, we can alſo vnderſtand, that tho theſe our natural, earthly corruptible bodies, cannot be at one time in many places; yet glorious bodies, being ſpiritualized, by virtue of their ſpiritual endowments, may be in many places, as ſpiritual ſubſtances are.

An other repugnance againſt reaſon our Dr pretends in this miſterie, that the accidents of bread would exiſt without their ſubſtance to ſupport them: yet we have ſeveral examples in Scrip-

ture of the exiſtence of *Accidents* without their *Subſtances*: firſt the taſt of all victuals was in the *Manna*, and our Dr will not pretend the ſubſtãces of all victuals were there: ſecondly Tobias did ſee viſibly the Accidents of a human nature in his fellow Travaller; and Scripture aſſures vs he was no man, but an Angel: thirdly Scripture tells vs the Apoſtles did ſee the Accidents of a Pigeon in *Iordan*; and the ſubſtance of a Pigeon was not there to ſupport them; the Iſraelits Exod. 13. did ſee a Pillar of a cloud, which lead them by day, and a Pillar of fire which lead them by night, and there was no ſubſtance either of a cloud or of fire, but only the Accidents: and why may not the accidents of bread be in the Sacrament, tho their ſubſtance be not there to ſupport them?

It's time we examin our Dr's anſwer to my ſecond ſyllogiſm: he ſaies he can reckon as many vices in it as in my firſt; but what was expected was, not to tell vs what he could do, but to point out thoſe vices: it was vpon that paſſage of John, 6. when Chriſt ſaid, *my fleſh is truly meate my blood is truly*

drink; the Jewes repleyed; *this saying is hard, how can this man give vs his flesh to be eaten*: I proposed two syllogisms, the first was thus; The Jews thought impossible what Christ affirmed; but what the Jews thought to be impossible, was that he should give his true flesh to be eaten; for no man ever yet apprehended any impossibilitie in giuing the figure of his body to be eaten; especiallie the Iews, who eat yeerly the Paschal lamb, which they believed to be the figure of Christ; therefore what Christ affirmed, was that he would give his true and real flesh. My Adversarie very civily lets this syllogism pass in sylence. And any man would think its a pinching argument.

My second syllogism vpon that passage was; A damnable vnbeliever is he who denies a Truth, sufficiently proposed to him to be revealed; for tho a man may be an Vnbeliever for denying a Truth, but not a *Damnable one*, if it be not sufficiently proposed to him to be revealed: but the Jews in this occasion are called damnable vnbelievers, and what they denied, was a real fleshy eating of Christs flesh, as Catholics be-

lieve it: therefore Christ sufficiently proposed a real fleshy eating of his body, as we believe it: My Adversarie quarrels with the *Minor* of the second proposition, which he conceits to bea paralogism because he saies its composed of two different propositions: but this is but a poor shift to divert his Reader, and draw breath; for the sense of the Minor appears to any half eyed man to be this, *The Iews were called damnable vnbelievers, because they denyed the fleshy eating of Christs body*: what saie you to this Proposition Dr? He denies it, and this is the whole and sole answer we have from our Dr a naked denial, without giving any textor reason, why; but tells vs they were called *damnable vnbelievers not for denying the fleshy eating of his Body, but because they misunderstood Christ, and did not vnderstand that he spoke only of his figurative flesh.* But the *non* sense of this answer is threefold; first for to be a damnable vnbeliever it's necessarie to deny a *truth*, as our Dr himself confesses, and as all rhe world must confess; but the Jews did not deny the *figurative Presence*, for our Dr himself, both in his printed sermon and in his

Book, pag. 115. ſaies that they did not aprehend that Chriſt at all ſpoke of his figurative Preſence, but of his reall fleſhy Preſence; and how could they deny or affirm, what they did not as much as dream was ſpoken of? ſecondly to be a *Damnable* vnbeliever, The truth muſt be ſufficiently propoſed to the deniers; and our Dr himſelf acknowledges that nothing of a figurative Preſence was ſufficiently propoſed to them; whereas he acknowledges, that they did not apprehend that Chriſt ſhould have ſpoken of his figurative Preſence, but of a real fleſhy eating of his body; Chriſt's meaning therefore was not ſufficiently declared vnto them; how could they therefore be damnable vnbelievers: thirdly he ſaies *They did miſaprehend Chriſt's Words, and did not vnderſtand him to have ſpoken of his figurative Preſence.* And is it therefore they muſt be called damnable vnbelievers, becauſe they did not vnderſtand what Chriſt ſaid? will you call your Auditorie damn'd Heretics becauſe they do not vnderſtand you when you preach? to call a man a Dolt or a dull headed fellow, becauſe he does not vnderſtand, may paſs; but

we are all in a ſad condition, if we muſt be called damnable vnbelievers becauſe wee do not vnderſtand a Preacher or Teacher: I pray Reader conſider this diſcours, the Jews are called vnbelievers; therefore they muſt have denied ſom revealed Truths, but they denied no other but the real fleſhy eating of Chriſt's body, for the Dr himſelf ſaies, they vnderſtood Chriſt did ſpeak of that, and of nothing els; therefore they are damnable vnbelievers for denying the fleſhy eating of Chriſts body.

For to prove that Chriſt ſpoke of the figure of his fleſh, our Dr brings not a ſyllable of Scripture but that text which he cited in his Sermon and I anſwered in my former Treatiſe *The fleſh profiteth nothing, it's the Spirit that quickneth; my Words are Spirit and life.* He ſaies Chriſt gave them to vnderſtand by theſe words, that he was to give them a figure of his Body, and that it was a check for vnderſtanding him to have ſpoken of his true and real fleſh: and if you will not believe this vpon his bare word, you may chooſe, for he will give you no other ptoof: But that you may

know how much our Dr is miſtaken, you muſt know that the *Capharnits*, to whom Chriſt ſpoke, did not vnderſtand the Doctrin which S. Paul delivered vs; that this our natural earthly ſenſual body, ſhould in the Reſurrection riſe ſpiritualized, incorruptible, purified, and refined from our material earthly qualities; and ſhould be incorruptible as ſpirits, Agil as ſpirits, inviſible as ſpirits, able to abridge it ſelf to a narrow, or enlarge itſelf to a great ſpace as ſpirits: the Capharnits vnderſtood nothing of this, but imagined the body could not be otherwiſe, than as we ſee it with its material earthly qualities; and when they heard Chriſt ſay he would give them his fleſh to eat, they conceived he mean't his Body as they did ſee it vnder thoſe earthly material qualities, and that he would cut it in morſels and give it to them: this carnal ſenſual manner of vnderſtanding is what Chriſt checkt; *the fleſh profiteth nothing*, that's to ſay according their carnal ſenſual imagination of it; that they ought to vnderſtand him ſpiritually; that his fleſh ſhould be given in a ſpiritual way: Hear S. Auguſt. vpon this ſubject to. 9.

tract.

tract. 27. in Joan. *What means the fleſh profiteth nothing? it profiteth nothing as they (the Capharnits) vnderſtood it; for they vnderſtood it, as one cuts it in morſels when the Body is dead, or as it is ſold in the Butcher's ſtall, and not as it is ſpiritualized: Again S. Auguſt. in Pſ.* 18. *Our Saviour has given vs to eate the ſame fleſh, which was born of the Virgin, wherin he converſed with vs on earth, but in a ſpiritual manner.* S. Chryſoſt. is no leſs expreſs Hom 24. in 6. Joan. *How doth the fleſh profit nothing, without which none can have life? obſerve that this is not ſaid of Chriſt's true fleſh, but of their (Capharnits) fleſhly ſenſual vnderſtanding of his words.*

I expected to meet in my Adverſari's book ſom text of Scripture directly proving his figurative Preſence, that he had not alleadged in his Sermon; but our Dr is a *Spaniard*, he ſticks to his old faſhion, nothing of new will you hardly find in any of the points he treats, but what he ſaid before in his Sermon: he cites again S. Paul calling the bread after its conſecration, *Bread*; and takes no notice of the anſwer I gave him in my former Treatiſe, that when a thing is converted into an other, it

often retains the name of what it was; as *The blind ſee*, *the lame walk* &c. after they recouered their ſight and limbs, they are ſo called, becauſe they were ſo: and becauſe the texts are ſomtimes to be vnderſtood in a Metaphorical ſenſe ſomtimes in a literal, I gave a rule for to diſtinguiſh the one from the other: when a word is equivocal bearing two ſignifications; putting it in a propoſition, its determined to ſignifie that ſenſe of which, and of no other, the Predicat can be verified: as the word *Man*, is indifferent to ſignifie a true real Man or a painted one, put it in a Propoſition, *A Man is a rational creature*; there it is determined to ſignifie a true real Man, becauſe of him only, the Predicat, *Rational creature*, can be verified: The word *Bread* alſo is indifferent to ſignifie true material bread, or bread only in appearance: will you know which ſenſe it beares in S. Pauls diſcours? ſee what Predicats are ſaid of that bread; *The bread which I ſhall give is my fleſh for the life of the world*, this Predicat *fleſh which I ſhall give for the life of* the world cannot be ſaid of true material bread; therefore that bread

which S. Paul ſpeakes of, is not true Material bread: Chriſt ſaies he is a *Vine*, a *Lamb* put them in propoſitions; *Chriſt is the true vine, which yields fruit to life euerlaſting; the lamb which takes away the ſins of the world*; theſe Predicats cannot he verified of a material *vine* and *lamb*: therefore they muſt be taken in a Metaphorical ſenſe. Our Dr without doubt would have been ſo kind as to have advertis'd vs, if he had found this Rule did faulter; but tho he nibbles at it, he cannot weaken it.

XVI. CHAPTER.

TRANSVBSTANTIATION PROVED by the conſent of Fathers.

NOt one of the firſt Reformers but exclaimed againſt the Ancient Fathers as Fautors of Popery, carried away with the deluge of errors which ouerflowed the whole Church: this they preached and printed, toxicating the brains of their Proſelites with the contempt of Fathers and vndervalue of

their authority, not only in the firſt beginning of the Reformation, but for ſom years after: but Poſterity, as men reclaimed from a Phrenſy, began to think, how heatheniſh a crime it was to pull down the Pillars of Chriſtianity; and particularly the Church of England feeling the attacks of the *Presbiterians* againſt Epiſcopacy, and ſom practices of theirs; for which they can ſhew no other warrant but Tradition, began to revere the authority of the ancient Fathers, but ſo fraudulently, that where they ſeem to drop any word which favors them, they are brave men; but ſhew them whole Treatiſes in favor of our Catholic Tenets; they were blind, and carried away with the errors of their time: Who but Auguſtin? the greateſt Dr of the Church, when he calls the Euchariſt a Sign of Chriſt's body, (tho not as they pretend;) but produce his book, *De cura pro Mortuis* where he vigorouſly proves Purgatory; ſhew his expreſs words, for Prayers to Saints, and the Miracles of our Church which he relates; he was, they ſay, deceived by his Mother *Monica*, and hurried away by the errors of his time:

S. Bernard was, they ſay, a moſt Holy Orthodox Saint, when he bitterly checks the Pomp and Vanitie of the Court of Rome; but when he praiſes Monachiſm, teachs Purgatorie, preaches Tranſubſtantiation; he was Ignorant, ſaies Dr Sall, he was fouly deceived: S. Gregorie the great, was an incomparable man, when he ſpoke againſt John the Patriark ofConſtantinople, for vſurping the Title of *Univerſal Biſhop*; but tell them that he brought Popery into England, *Maſs*, *Purgatorie* &c. Fox ſaies, he is in hell for his pains.

Now you are to obſerve, Reader, that the ancient Fathers, ſomtimes deſignedly ſpoke obcurely of the Miſteries of our Religion, and particularly of the holy Euchariſt; ſpecially when they did ſpeake in preſence of *Pagans* and *Cathecumens*; becauſe, they not being received into the Church, nor ſufficiently inſtructed, might be ſurpriſed and deterred from following Chriſt by the ſublimitie of this Miſterie: as the Capharnits were, when it was propoſed to them: this wee know by Theod. quoted by Dr Sall, Dial. 2. where ſpeak-

ing of this Misterie he saies; *Non oportet hæc aperte dicere; est enim verosimile adesse aliquos Initiatos*: its not expedient to speake more openly of these things, for probably there may be som Catechumens present. S. Augustin, in psal. 109. saies the same, and Serm 46. de Verb. Dom. and our Dr and his fellow wranglers take an advantage from hence, snatching som of their obscure tetms, and gleaning heer and there som little fragments, dismember'd from their cleer words, and from the end and scope of their discours as wil appear by few examples; My Antagonist cites Theodoret Dial. 2. and Gelasius Pope de Duab. Natur. who say *The symbols are not changed in their nature, but abide in their proper substance, figure, and form and are toucht and seen as before.* Heer our Dr stops, and very disingenuously omits the immediatly following words of Theodoret; *Those mystical signs are understood to be, what they are made to be, and they are believed and adored as being those things which they are believed to be.* Could any man who professes to speake obscurely, speakes in cleerer terms? he saies they are *believed* and *adored as being* what *they are made to be*: if they are made to be

a figure only of Christ's body, they are not *to be adored* in the Protestant Doctrin, which denies the adoration of Images: they are not changed he saies, but abide in their *nature substance*, *form* and *figure*, and yet he saies *hey are made to be* an object of our *Adoration*; certainly the Physical true substance of bread is no object of *Adoration*; *they are toucht and seen* as before; and the true *substance* of bread is not toucht or seen; only the Accidents of created *substances* are the Objects of our senses: whence it appears, that by *Nature*, *Substance*, *Figure*, and *Form* Theodoret vnderstands the Accidents of bread which remain in the consecrated host in their proper nature as before; and the Nature of a thing may be called it's substance.

By the way, take notice, that our Dr in his printed Sermon impugning our Tenet of Infallibility, directed his arrows at the Infallibility of the Pope alone: I advertis'd him, this was not our Tenet of faith, but a schoole question; that our Article of faith was, the Infallibility of the Pope and Council joyntly, and of the Church diffusive: In his 3. and 5. Chapt. of his booke he

railes at me, that I impoſe vpon him in ſaying he ſhould have ſpoken of the Pope alone; *It's an intolerable cauill, ſaies he of I S. to ſay, I ſhould ſpeake of the Pope alone's Infallibility; a groſs miſunderſtanding of my meaning, for which I gaue no ground in my Writings: I ſpeake of the Infallibility of the Pope and Partie following him, whether congregated or diſperſed.* Have you heard him proteſt, that when he impugns our Tenet of Infallibility, he does not mean, nor ſpeak of that of the Pope alone? Heare him again reproach our Religion and faith as ridiculous, for believing the Infallibility of the Pope alone; (tho he knows, as it appears by his former words, this is not our Article of faith, nor bottom whervpon wee reſt our faith.) Chap. 19 after having cited Gelaſius his ſentence, *that the Subſtance and nature of bread and wine remains in the conſecrated Elements*, as if, for being the judgment of a Pope, wee muſt yield becauſe wee believe him Infallible; *Will you find a way ſaies he, for to decline ſuch a ſentence?* Yes Dr three waies; firſt you muſt prove againſt Bellar. Baron. and ſeveral others, that he was a Pope; ſecondly you muſt prove he delivered that Doc-

trin after his inſtallment, and not before he was made Pope; thirdly you muſt prove he delivered that Doctrin ex *Cathedra*; that is to ſay as Maſter and Paſtor of the Church, propoſing to the flock what they ought to believe; for a Pope who ſpeakes his privat ſentiments, as a particular Doctor, may err: Moreouer Dr tho the Pope alone were infallible, and tho the Pope and Council joyntly be infallible; what they ſay only occaſionally and tranſiently in their Decrees is not infallibly true; for tho their Decrees in matters of Doctrin be true, but the reaſons, arguments, and ſimilitudes by which they expound their Doctrin, are not infallible Verities; and if you have read Gelaſius, or if you be at leaſure to read him; you will find that the Subject and ſcope of his diſcours, was of the *Two Natures of Chriſt*, proving it againſt *Euthyces* and *Neſtorius*, and that he ſpoke of the Miſterie of the Conſecrated Bread tranſiently, as a parity or ſimilitude by which he pretends to prove the exiſtence of both Natures, Divin and Human, in Chriſt: laſtly, ſuppoſe the words of Gelaſius prove evidently the ſubſtance

of bread to remain in the Sacrament; what are you the neerer to prove your figurative Preſence? for the Lutherans will grant the bread is there; but that Chriſt's body is alſo there, togither with the bread, as both Natures, human and Divin, are in Chriſt

And to ſhew you our Drs diſingenuitie and fraud, heare him conclude his 19 Chapt. *Conclude Reader from this paſſage of Gelaſius what hopes wee may have of peace, and end of Controverſies, by allowing the Pope to be infallible, when the cleer and plain words of a Pope are ſubject to ſuch miſconſtructions*: giving his Reader to vnderſtand, that we bottom our faith on the Infallibility of the Pope alone, and make him only, the infallible Judge to decide our Controverſies: and this our Dr ſaies, after all his Proteſtations, that when he impugns and rebukes our Doctrin of Infallibility, he does not ſpeak of, or mean that of the Pope alone; as if wee had not plainly declared that our Catholic Tenet is not of the Infallibility of the Pope alone, but jointly with the Council.

He cites S. Auguſtin alſo who often calls the Euchariſt a ſign and type of

Chriſt's Body; It's true he does; but it's no leſs true that he did not meane the Euchariſt was a *pure* and *only* ſign; but a Sign, and the thing ſignified: the Body of Chriſt in the Euchariſt, is a ſign of itſelf as it was on the croſs; and, that this was S. Auguſtins meaning, our Dr could not doubt of't, had he read S. Auguſtin in Pſal. 33. where gloſſing vpon the words of the Prophet *He was carried in his own hands*, he ſaies, *Wee do not find that this was literally verified of David, but we find it literally verified of Chriſt, when, he ſaied, this is my Body, he carried his Body in his hands.* S. Auguſtin, as you ſee, ſaies, that text, *this is my Body*, muſt be vnderſtood *literally*, and was *literally* verified of Chriſt, when he pronounced it; but if what Chriſt carried then in his hands was a pure, and only a ſign of his body, the text would not be literally verified of him; it's not his body he would carrie in his hand, but a ſign of his Body: nor would S. Auguſtin have ſaid, as we quoted him in the precedent Chapter, *that our Saviour gave vs to eat the ſam fleſh which was born of the Virgin, and wherin he converſed with vs on earth*: But where

our adverſarie ſounds a perfect Victorie againſt vs, is in the paſſage of S. Auguſtin in Pſal. 38. *You muſt vnderſtand Spiritually, what I ſaid; you ſhall not eate this body which you ſee, nor drink this blood which ſhall be ſpilt by thoſe who will crucifie me; I have recommended vnto you a Sacrament which (ſpiritually vnderſtood) will give life; it is needfull it be celebrated viſibly; but it muſt be vnderſtood ſpiritually*: take theſe words of the Saint ſeparatly from the ſcope and end of his diſcours, and they may ſtartle you: but if you conſider that, as I have related aboue, he checked the ſenſual material vnderſtanding of the Capharnits, who judged Chriſt intended his Body to be eaten vnder thoſe material earthly qualities as it appeared to their eyes, S. Auguſtin mean't nothing els but to rectifie their error, telling them they were not to eat that fleſh and blood of Chriſt which they did ſee, as they did ſee it vnder thoſe accidents and qualities; but in a ſpiritual manner, as glorious bodies exiſt, as we declared in the precedent Chapter; and that S. Auguſtin did not think of denying Chriſt's true and real fleſh ſhould be given, it ap-

pears, wheras he ſaies, *he would giue vs the ſame fleſh to eat, which was born of the Virgin, and wherin he converſed with vs on earth.*

Our Dr cites alſo *Dioniſius Syrus*, vpon the firſt Chap. of S. John tranſlated into Engliſh by Dr Loftus; affirming the *Word was made fleſh without any change in the Divinity, as the bread is changed into the Body of Chriſt without any change in its nature*: the Tranſlator I honor for his learning and erudition; the works of Dioniſius Syrus I have not ſeen, but allow he has ſpoken as he is tranſlated; firſt this, and all you have hitherto ſaid, Favors Luthers opinion of Conſubſtantiation, more than the Proteſtant Doctrin of Figurative Preſence; for all you have ſaid proves only, that the ſubſtance of bread remains; but how do you prove againſt Luther or againſt vs, that the Body of Chriſt is not ſubſtantially and really there? if Dioniſius Syrus be of ſo great weight with you, you muſt ſay, that as the Word of God being made fleſh; *both* natures and ſubſtances remain in Chriſt; of *fleſh*, and of the Divinity, ſo when the bread is made the Body of Chriſt, there muſt remain both natures

and Subſtances of Chriſt's body and the bread, in the Sacrament; and this is Luthers Doctrin, nothing a kin to the figurative Preſence of England: Secondly what do you talk to vs of a Dioniſius Syrus, or of Gelaſius, an vnknowen Author? put both, and more of their rank, if you can get them, in one balance; and put S. Auguſtin, S. Chriſoſtom, S. Ambros, S. Cyprian, S. Hierom, and the reſt of the knowen, renowned, and moſt illuſtrious Doctors and Pillars of Chriſtianity in an other; and tell me which of them weighs moſt? reade S. Ambroſe l. 4. de Sacram. c. 4. *You will ſay my bread is vſual bread; No, this bread which is bread before the Sacramental* Words, *when the conſecration is performed, of bread is made the fleſh of Chriſt*; and to preuent our Adverſaries cauil of a figurative fleſh, he ſaies l. 6. de Sacram. c. 1. *as our Lord Ieſus Chriſt is the true ſon of God, not as men are by grace, but as the ſon of the ſubſtance of his father; ſo, it is his very true fleſh, as himſelf has ſaid, and his very true blood we eat and drink*: I do not wonder that Calvin wiſht, (as they ſay he did) that the Devil had ſtruck the pen out of S. Ambroſe

his hand when he was writing of this Misterie; for there can be nothing more cleer againſt his figurative Preſence: and again l. de *Initiandis* c. 9. he ſaies *the bread is changed into the Body of Chriſt, as Moyſes his rod was turned into a ſerpent, as the waters of Egipt were turn'd into blood; and the water into wine in the Marriage of Cana of Galilee, the word of God which made of nothing, that to be, which was not; can not it change that which was, to be that which it was not before?* Face theſe words of S. Ambroſe with thoſe of DioniſiusSyrus and ſee which of both is of moſt credit in the Chriſtian world, Ambroſe or Dioniſius:

And if you think Ambroſe does not outweigh him, add S. Cyprian, ſerm. de Cœn. Dñi; *The bread which our Lord gave to his diſciples was changed, not in appearance but in nature, and by the Omnipotency of his* Word *was made fleſh.* Euſeb. Emiſſ. Serm. de Corp. Dñi, *The inviſible Prieſt Chriſt, does change by his inviſible power the viſible creatures to the ſubſtance of his Body and blood: when the viſible creatures are put upon the altar, before the invocation of the Holy Ghoſt for to bleſs them, the ſubſtance of bread and wine is there; but*

after the conſecration, the Body and blood of Chriſt; we muſt judge of this Hoſt not by our ſenſes, or exteriour appearance, but by our faith. S. Hierom. in Epiſt. ad Hebr. quæſt. 20. *Let us underſtand that the bread which Chriſt gave to his Diſciples, is the body of Chriſt; Moyſes did not give the true bread* (yet he gave the Manna, which was a figure of Chriſt) *but Chriſt gave it; Chriſt himſelf is the gueſt and the banquet; he himſelf is he who eates, and is eaten,* Add to theſe the teſtimonies of S. Auguſtin, S. Chryſoſtom, S. Cyril, and S. Epiph. which I produced in the precedent, and I will produce in the next enſuing Chapter; and pretend not for ſom half ſentences pickt heer and there out of ſom Ancient Fathers work, and wreſted to a crooked ſence which they never thought of; pretend not I ſay, that the Ancient Fathers do favor your Error; it would be more ingenuity in you to ſay, as your Anceſtors, the firſt Reformers ſaid, that the Ancient Fathers were blind, and carried away with our Popiſh ſuperſtitions; and as you forſook the Church with them, to renounce to the Fathers as they did.

XVII.

XVII. CHAPTER.

THE ADORATION OF THE HOST; and Communion in one Kind.

THer's no need of an Antagoniſt for to contradict our Dr. for in every chapter almoſt, he contradicts himſelf; in the percloſe of his 20. chap. he blends vp two contradictorie propoſitions in one paragragh; *I do not ignore nor doubt, ſaies he, that if your Doctrin of Chriſt's perſonal preſence in the conſecrated Hoſt be true, ther's as much reaſon for to adore ſuch an Hoſt as to adore Chriſt himſelf, both being the ſame thing in ſuch a ſuppoſition*: then again he ads, *It's an intolerable boldneſs to ſay, the matter ſtanding as now it doth, doubtfull and controverted, there is as much reaſon to adore Chriſt in the conſecrated Hoſt, as there is for adoring him in his own perſon, ſince that for adoring Chriſt wee haue an expreſs command, but no command of adoring Chriſt in the Sacramental bread even ſuppoſing him to be corporally preſent there.* You ſee how in one breath the

Dr saies wee are obliged to adore the consecrated Host supposing Christ to be there personally present, and that yet supposing him to be there personally present we are not obliged to adore him: But the reason he gives why we are not obliged to adore him, tho he should be there personally present, is very pretty; because saies he, that for adoring Christ in his own person we have a positive command, but we have no command for adoring him in the consecrated Host, tho he should be there personally present: as if the general command of adoring Christ in flesh, did not reach for to oblige vs to adore him whereſoeuer he is really present in flesh; doubtless he must say the three kings were intolerably bold for adoring him in the Manger, because there was no particular cōmand of adoring him in a manger; But Dr, is there any particular command of not adoring Christ in the Host, tho he should be there personally present? No; and will not a general cōmand of adoring him in flesh personally present oblige vs to adore him, whereſoeuer he be personally present, if there be not a particular com-

mand excluding ſuch and ſuch caſes where he muſt not be adored ? If the Bleſſed Trinitie did appear to you in the ſhape of three yong men , as happen'd to Abraham , and that you were aſſured by a revelation it was the Bleſſed Trinitie , would not you in virtue of the General Command of adoring the Trinitie, hold yourſelf obliged to adore it , tho there be no particular command of adoring it vnder the ſhape of a man? The general command laid vpon vs of having no commerce nor dealing with the Deuil , does it not oblige vs not to have any commerce nor dealing with him if he ſhould appear unto vs in the ſhape of *a great black Dog* ; tho there be no particular command , forbidding any communication with him in that ſhape ?

But ſaies he , it's an intolerable boldneſs to adore him in the Hoſt , the caſe ſtanding as it does doubtfull and controverted if he be there or not ; becauſe we expoſe ourſelves to a manifeſt danger of committing material Idolatrie at leaſt ; Juſt as if you did ſay when the Arians denied the Divinitie of Chriſt , it was intolerable boldneſs

in the Council of Nice to adore Christ as God, the matter being doubtfull and controverted: you mistake in your supposition Sr, we are not doubtfull, your doubts, denial, or controversies creat no doubt nor scruple in vs; we are certainly assured that Christ is there really presente, and wee pittie your Obstinacie in denying so assured a Tenet; and we fear not the hazard of a material Idolatrie, even in case that the Host were not duly consecrated for want of intention in the Priest for to consecrat, or because he is no true Priest, or what other defect you please: I had reason to say Dr, that you did not well vnderstand our Doctrin, and I may say now you do not vnderstand what *material Idolatrie* is, when you say, that it might happen that the Priest should not have an intention of consecrating, and then the Host would not be consecrated, and our Adoration of such an Host would be a Material Idolatry; and to this danger we are, you say, dayly exposed. I beseech you D if ever you write again, do your Reader the justice as to repley against your Adversari's answers to your arguments; you pro-

poſed this argument in your Sermon, and I plainly refuted it, by ſhewing you had as much reaſon to doubt of the Chriſtianity of all the world, and of the truth of your Proteſtant Clergy, for tho you do not make your Baptiſm or Ordination to depend of the intentiõ of the Miniſter, yet you make them depend of other eſſential requiſits, and you have no greater aſſurance of thoſe requiſits to have been applied, than we have of the Intention of the Prieſt in the Conſecration of the Hoſt.

And ſuppoſe that the Prieſt in effect had not an intention, but that the Hoſt remains vnconſecrated, we are not as much as materially Idolaters for adoring it; for Idolatrie whether Material or formal is when adoration is giuen to a Creature falſly believed to be God; the Pagans are Idolaters, for adoring the Sun, and the Iſraelits for adoring the Golden Calf, which Sun and Calf they belieued to be a Sun and a Calf, and yet a God; for they never pretended that the Sun and Calf ceaſed to be ſuch, and were converted into inviſible Deities; but they attributed Divinitie to them, remaining in their

proper Being of a Sun and a Calf: for to make vs therefore either formally or Materially Idolaters, you muſt proue that our Adoration is given to bread; remaining bread, and falſly believed by vs to be God; and if you ſay ſo, you widely miſtake our Doctrin and practice: for as your own Dr Taylor ſaies in his *Liberte of Prophecying*, c. 20. and your Dr Thorndick, *in his Iuſt weights*, c. 19. our Adoration is ſo far from being directed to bread, that wee believe the Object we adore is no bread, but God; Our Will goes by adoration to the Object, as it is in our Underſtanding, and in our Underſtanding its no bread but God; we do not adore bread believed to be God, but we adore God, believed to be no bread: where then leyes the danger of our material Idolatrie in adoring the Hoſt conſecrated? becauſe it remains vnconſecrated bread? but we do not adore what it remains to be, but what wee believe it is made by due conſecration.

And that you may ſee how raſh you were in your cenſure of *Intolerable boldneſs* for adoring the conſecrated Hoſt,

pray hear S. Auguſtin who ſaies in Pſal. 98. ſpeaking of the footſtool of our Lord, *That footſtool is the fleſh of Chriſt, wherin he walked on earth, and which he gave vs to eat, no man eateth that fleſh, who firſt hath not adored it, and wee do not only, not ſin in adoring it; but wee ſin in not adoring it.* S. Ambroſe l. 3. de Spir. Sancto, *wee adore the fleſh of Chriſt in the miſteries, which the Apoſtles adored in Chriſt our Lord:* S. Chryſoſ. hom. 24. in 1. ad Corin. *The wiſemen adored Chriſt in the Manger; let vs imitate them wee ſee him not in the Manger, but on the Altar.* Had theſe Saints any ſpecial command for adoring Chriſt in the conſecrated Hoſt? no, but the general command of adoring him in fleſh, and they believed his fleſh to be there: and if they were not intolerably raſh and bold for adoring it, why will you condemn vs?

In the *Vnerring Vnerrable Church* I have proved at large the ſufficiency of one kind in the Communion, by Scripture, reaſon, and authority of fathers; and wheras I find nothing in my Adverſaries repley that either weakens my diſcours, or ſtrengthens his own Tenet it's better to remit my Reader to what I have ſaid

there, than to weary his patience with a tedious Tatalogie: only I muſt advertiſe, that it's ſtrange a *Church of England* man, ſhould ſay the Cup is ſo indiſpenſably requiſit by Chriſt's Inſtitution, that it cannot vpon any conſideration be retrencht; ſo our Dr ſaies pag. 136. condemning the Council of Conſtance for Pretending any reaſon for ordaining the bread alone ſhould be taken; *This is ſufficient to me*, ſaies he, *that the Council ſhould pretend any reaſon for inverting the Inſtitution of Chriſt, which ordained alſo the Cup ſhould be taken*: Is it not ſtrange I ſay, that a Church of England man ſhould ſpeake ſo? after that the Statut of 1. Edward VI. goes thus; We *command that the Sacrament be commonly taken in both kinds, if neceſſitie does not require otherwiſe*: Do not thoſe words of the Statute *Commonly*, and, *if neceſſitie does not require otherwiſe* import that ſomtime for juſt reaſons and neceſſitie, we may be diſpenſed with, and receive in one kind? nor is it only the Church of England by its Head king Edward, has declared this, but alſo the Church of France in their Eccleſiaſtical Diſciplin printed at Saumur 12. Chap. Art. 7.

ſaies thus, *The Miniſter muſt give the bread in the ſupper to them who cannot drink the wine, provided it be not for contempt.* And tho the Lutheran Church vſe both kinds in the Communion, yet Luther plainly declares, it might be taken in one, and that its an indifferent thing: l. de Capt. Babil. c. de Euch. *They ſin not*, ſaies he, *who receive in one kind only, ſeeing Chriſt hath not commanded to vſe both*: and again Epiſt. and Bohæm. in declar. Euch. & Serm. de Euch. *although it were an excellent thing to vſe both kinds in the Euchariſt, and Chriſt hath commanded nothing in this point as neceſſarie; it were better to follow peace and Vnity, than to conteſt about the kinds.* Melancton alſo has expreſly the ſame Doctrin in Conſil. Theol. ad Marchionem Elect. de vſu vtriuſque partis, pag. 141.

I appeal now to any prudent vnprejudic'd mans judgment, who is in the wrong, Dr Sall, or I: the Dr ſaies, the Cup is of Divin inſtitution ſo indiſpenſablie needfull that it cannot for any reaſon be omitted, and blames the Council of Conſtance for pretending a juſt reaſon for retrenching it and the Dr has of his ſide the Church of Eng-

there, than to weary his patience with a tedious Tatalogie: only I muſt advertiſe, that it's ſtrange a *Church of England* man, ſhould ſay the Cup is ſo indiſpenſably requiſit by Chriſt's Inſtitution, that it cannot vpon any conſideration be retrencht; ſo our Dr ſaies pag. 136. condemning the Council of Conſtance for Pretending any reaſon for ordaining the bread alone ſhould be taken; *This is ſufficient to me*, ſaies he, *that the Council ſhould pretend any reaſon for inverting the Inſtitution of Chriſt, which ordained alſo the Cup ſhould be taken*: Is it not ſtrange I ſay, that a Church of England man ſhould ſpeake ſo? after that the Statut of 1. Edward VI. goes thus; *We command that the Sacrament be commonly taken in both kinds, if neceſſitie does not require otherwiſe*: Do not thoſe words of the Statute *Commonly*, and, *if neceſſitie does not require otherwiſe* import that ſomtime for juſt reaſons and neceſſitie, we may be diſpenſed with, and receive in one kind? nor is it only the Church of England by its Head king Edward, has declared this, but alſo the Church of France in their Eccleſiaſtical Diſciplin printed at Saumur 12. Chap. Art. 7.

ſaies thus, *The Miniſter muſt give the bread in the ſupper to them who cannot drink the wine, provided it be not for contempt.* And tho the Lutheran Church vſe both kinds in the Communion, yet Luther plainly declares, it might be taken in one, and that its an indifferent thing: l. de Capt. Babil. c. de Euch. *They ſin not*, ſaies he, *who receive in one kind only, ſeeing Chriſt hath not commanded to vſe both*: and again Epiſt. and Bohæm. in declar. Euch. & Serm. de Euch. *although it were an excellent thing to vſe both kinds in the Euchariſt, and Chriſt hath commanded nothing in this point as neceſſarie; it were better to follow peace and Vnity, than to conteſt about the kinds.* Melancton alſo has expreſly the ſame Doctrin in Conſil. Theol. ad Marchionem Elect. de vſu vtriuſque partis, pag. 141.

I appeal now to any prudent vnprejudic'd mans judgment, who is in the wrong, Dr Sall, or I: the Dr ſaies, the Cup is of Divin inſtitution ſo indiſpenſablie needfull that it cannot for any reaſon be omitted, and blames the Council of Conſtance for pretending a juſt reaſon for retrenching it and the Dr has of his ſide the Church of Eng-

land ; as now it is ; I ſay ; the Cup is not indiſpenſably requiſit for the integrity of the Communion ; that Chriſt has left it arbitrary to the Church , to give either the bread alone , or the bread and cup togither ; as time and neceſſitie ſhall require ; and I have on my ſide not only the whole Catholic Church , but even Luther and Melancton , and the Church of England in king Edwards time, and the Church of France this day ; for tho the Hugonots vulgarly are in that perſwaſion , I know not by what charm , that both kinds are needfull ; yet their Eccleſiaſtical Diſciplin , as I quoted , plainlie ſets down they may for juſt reaſons receive in one kind ; have I not think you the advantage aboue the Dr ? I pray read my former Trearise , where you ſhall find this Tenet ſolidly proved by Scripture and reaſon.

XVIII. CHAPTER.

IMAGE WORSHIP NO IDOLATRIE.

IF you conſider the vndertaking, or the proofs of the vndertakers, in no where will you find the Proteſtants more vnjuſt, than in their charge of Idolatry againſt vs for the worſhip of Images: for Idolatrie being the adoration of a creature as God; or the Image of a fals God; can there be any thing more vnjuſt than to charge vs with that ſin, who plainly avow Images are but creatures and no God; who look vpon them, as the Images of the only God of Heaven and earth, and of Jeſus Chriſt who is no fals, but a true God; wee aſk nothing of them; wee place not our hopes in them, but wee aſk of, and place our hope in him whom they repreſent. Where is there any thing of Idolatry in this? or what can there be more conformable to reaſon, than that wee ſhould honor the picture of God, whom wee adore; as the picture of the king is

honored aboue that of any ſubject; and there is none but will think the injury or honor don to his picture, for being his repreſentation, to be an injurie againſt his own Perſon: This charge is alſo injuſt, becauſe the Proteſtants allow ſalvation in the Catholic Church, and the actual profeſſion of its Tenets, if ignorance does not excuſe vs; and how can ſalvation be allowed in the actual profeſſion of Idolatrie; or ignorance be pretended amidſt ſo much of Chriſtianity and light of the Ghoſpel? It's alſo injuſt becauſe wee are no more guiltie in this Tenet, than Lutherans who revereImages as much as wee; nay no more than Proteſtants, who as I have obſerved in my former Treatiſe, religiouſly reſpect the Lords ſupper which they ſay, is but a figure or Image of Chriſt's Body: which S. Paul recommends 1. Cor. 11. *Let a man examin himſelf, and ſo let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup, for he who eates or drinks it vnworthily eates and drinks damnation to himſelf not diſcerning the body of the Lord he is guiltie of the body and blood of our Lord.* You ſee what an honor what a reſpect, what a puritie of heart, you are to

haue; and you yourſelves confeſs you muſt have, for to receive that which you ſay is but a figure, and an Image of Chriſt's body, and a repreſentation of his Paſſion.

My Dr is put to his ſhifts by this argument, and moſt deſperatly ſaies *there is no ſign nor inſinuation of adoration, to be given to the Communion bread, in that text of S. Paul; its a work of my fancy he ſaies, no diſcovery of common ſenſe.* My God? how much a Polemical animoſitie blinds a man? Is there any Proteſtant in England ſo impious, take him out of the heat of a Polemical diſcours, but will ſay the Conſecrated bread is to be worſhip'd? or is there any, but Dr Sall, who will ſay there is no ſign or inſinnuation of that whorſhip in thoſe words of S. Paul? that purity of mind, that ſcrutiny of our defects, that cleanlyneſs of heart which he enjoyns, is not this an inſinuation and ſign of the reverence wherwith wee ought to aproach to that Miſterie? and is not that reverence a worſhip, and honor wee pay to that bread? and why becauſe in receiving it vnworthily, wee diſhonor the body of Chriſt: Chriſt therefore is diſhono-

red in his figure ; wee deſerve damnation by diſhonoring it ; and why are wee damn'd , but for our injurie to Chriſt? wee are guiltie of the body of Chriſt ; is it not an evident ſequele out of this , that the injurie , diſhonor and irreverence don to Chriſt's figure (which you ſay is the Communion bread) is don to Chriſt's own Perſon ? why will you then deny that God is honored or diſhonored in his picture ?

Wee have heard S. Auguſtin , S. Ambroſe S. Chryſoſtom in the next precedent Chapter ſay , that the conſecrated Hoſt is to be adored , and that it is a ſin ſaies S. Auguſtin not to adore it ; caſt an eye back on the words of theſe Saints in the former Chapter , whylſt I aſk my Dr what does he believe to be in the Communion bread ? if the true an real fleſh of Chriſt , that thoſe Saints would have vs adore, then he muſt acknowledge Tranſubſtantiation , if it be but Bread repreſenting figuratively Chriſt's Body , what they would have vs adore ; then he muſt confeſs , its no Idolatrie to adore the figure and Image of Chriſt.

Our Dr after his acuſtomed faſhion ,

does but repeat what he ſaid in his Sermon againſt this Tenet, and takes no notice of what I anſwered: he tells vs God commanded in *Exodus*, *Thou ſhalt not make to thee any graven Image - thou ſhalt not bow down they ſelf to them*: and where is there any mention heer of not worshipping Images? for the letter of the text is, *not to make any graven Image*; and if the making of an Image be Idolatrie or adoration, you are no leſs guiltie than wee; the text ſaies *thou ſhalt not bow they ſelf* to them; Joſue and the Iſraëlits did ſo to the Ark, as you acknowledge, and you do it to the Image of our Prince, and ſo we are all Idolaters. But ſaies he, when *the Iſraelits did look on the Serpent in the Deſert, and were thereby healed; and when Ioſue and the Iſraelits fell down on their faces before the Ark, they did not adore it, otherwiſe when we pray before the Bible and an Altar we muſt adore them*: was there euer the like Childiſhneſs? He does not vnderſtand, or at leaſt will not vnderſtand my diſcours vpon thoſe paſſages; which is this: It's manifeſtly declared in Scripture that the *braſen Serpent* was erected vpon a Pole by Gods command, and it

appears Jo. 3. 14. that this Serpent was an Image of Christ Crucified, S. Aug. de Pecc. Mort l. 1. c. 32. *exaltatus Serpens est mors Christi*; hence it follows that it's not against Gods commandment to make Images of Christ; secondly its apparent that when the Israelits looking on this Serpent were healed, they came before it, and looked on it with respect, reverence, and devotion, being the instrument which God vsed to heale them; and tho the vulgar sort of the people were perhaps ignorant of the misterie represented by that Serpent elevated vpon a heigh Pole; doubtless Moyses and the learned of the people did know it was a representation of Christ vpon the cross, by whom man kind should be healed from the venom of the infernal serpent, as all the interpreters say: so that an ingenuous Reader will not doubt, but that that Serpent was worshiped and deuoutly revered by the wounded Israelits, as now wee Catholics do revere and worship a *Crucifix*: all this was don by Gods command; wherby its manifest that the worship of Christs Image; our access and prayers to him before his Image; and

our

our belief, that Christ by his Images, before which we pray, does confer many blessings vpon vs, as God did vpon the Jews by the brasen Serpent) is not idolatrous superstition or against Gods command; moreouer that God should have commanded Kings. 18. that Serpent to be broken by Ezechias, when the people pass'd the bonds of devotion, to adore it as God, and not as the Image of God, convinces plainly that what God forbids in the first Commandment, is the Adoration of Images or Similitudes as Gods; for whilst the people looked vpon it as Gods Image, their devotion was permitted, and rewarded by God with miraculous cures; but when they looked vpon it as a God; then God was angrie, and commanded it to be destroied.

This and the example of the Ark (which all Interpreters declare to be God's Image) before which Josue and the people did prostrat themselves reverently on the ground; and which David honored with processions and many other marks of devotion, demonstrats the vse of Images not to be forbid den by God, nor to be Superstitious or

Idolatrous in vs ; and your little quillet is ridiculous ; *then* ſay you, *when wee look on a Church ; or the Bible , or the Altar wee adore it* : certainly Dr you will not be ſo impious , as to deny , that there is a ſpecial reverence due to a Church , more than to an other houſe , becauſe it's particularly dedicated to Gods ſervice ; and a particular Veneration for the Bible, becauſe it contains the Hiſtorie of Chriſt's Paſſion and Divin Truths, more than for *Titus Livius* , or *Lucius Florus* ; and why will not you have a greater reverence for the Image of God , and his Saints , for being their repreſentation , than you have for the kings picture and chair of ſtate before which you dare not be couer'd in the chamber of Preſence. O but ſay you this is no adoration : piſh Dr what a Childiſh cauil is this ; It's a religious veneration , reſpect , honor and worſhip which wee exhibit to the Image for being a repreſentation of God ; call it adoration , or not ; this wee vnderſtand by Adoration : what do you call , your being bare headed before the king ? will not you call it a worſhip and reverence to the king ? and what will you

call your being bare headed in the Chamber of Preſence, before his picture and chair of ſtate? you muſt call it a worſhip alſo, and reverence given to the picture and chair for the Kings ſake which they repreſent: even ſo your bowing on your knees to God, your offering donaries to him, your proceſſions for his ſake do not you call this worſhip, an *adoration* of God; ſo likwiſe your kneeling, praying, and other marks of devotion before an Image, is a worſhip and adoration of the Image, for being the Image and type of God.

You are tedious in telling vs again that Azor, Vaſq. and our Schoolmen ſaie, Images of God and the Saints muſt be adored with the ſame degree of adoration, that the Saints are adored with, and ſo Images of God muſt be adored *Cultu Latriæ*, which is Idolatrie: but whoeuer reades our School Divins, will find that they who ſay Images muſt be adored with the ſame adoration that is giuen to their Prototipes, *Latria* to Chriſt's Image, *hyperdulia* to the B. Virgins Image, and *Dulia* to Saints Images, they plainly and diſtinctly diſtinguiſh a *Relative* and an *Abſo-*

lut Adoration; and ſay that the ſame adoration which is given to the Prototype muſt be given to the type, but differently; to the Prototype an *Abſolut* adoration; to the Type, a *relative*; ſo God is adored with an abſolut *Latria*, that's to ſay for his own ſake; his Image is to be adored with a Relative *Latria*, that's to ſay not for its ſelf, but for the relation it has to God, in as much as it is his repreſentation. The adoration of *Latria* given to God, as an abſolut ſource of all goodneſs and an infinit Deytie, is given to none but to him; to his Image wee give a greater adoration, reſpect, and honor, than to the Image of the B. Virgin or Saints, becauſe it's a repreſentation of God; and this we call a Relative *Latria*: and when our Doctrin apears to be ſo innocent, and our practice in our adoration of Images, is ſo cleerly declared by our Councils and Schoolmen; its vnbecoming any man of honor and ſincerity to be nibbling at our words, and wreſting them to malicious ſences, and little ſpaniſh Proverbs and Idle ſtories of abuſes that he has ſeen in Spain or read in *Ludovicus*

Vives, in *Polydorus Virgilius and Caſſander*, which ſerve but to give the Printer work, and render the Author ridiculous: yes indeed *Polydorus Virgilius*, and *Caſſander* and *Ludovicus Vives* muſt be believed, when they tell vs ſom abuſes of the vulgar people in the adoration of Images; and S. Auguſtin, S. Bernard, S. Gregorie, S Damian, and other Saints and Doctors of the Church, muſt not be credited, when they tell vs many Miracles wrought in defenſe of the worſhip of Images: O but ſaies our Dr *our adoration of Images obſtructs the Converſion of Pagans: for how will they be diſſwaded from adoring ſtocks and ſtones, by vs, who do the ſame?* and will not his Reader laugh, to ſee Proteſtants ſo much concern'd for the Converſion of Pagans? a people who never ſent one Preacher to convert Infidels: but Dr we ſee, notwithſtanding your opinion of our Image Worſhip, God has even in this our age converted many Pagans, and kingdoms of Infidels by our Image-Worſhippers, and he never made vſe of your Image Breakers to convert any one Pagan.

In his 15. Chapt. he pretends to prove

that it is not only Idolatrie to adore an Image as God, but to adore God in an Image, or by an Image; *Give that Worſhip*, ſaies he, *what name you pleaſe, to worſhip them at all, is a formal tranſgreſſion againſt Gods precept*: this, he ſaies, and no other, was the Idolatrie of the Jews; not for that they did believe the Calf was God, for who can believe, they were ſo deſtitut of Common ſenſe as to judge that Image, made before their own face, and of their own Gold, was a true God? their Idolatrie then did conſiſt in adoring the Calf as God's Image, or adoring God in that Image: the like he ſaies of the Pagans, ſuch wiſe cleer ſighted men, as many of them were, did never imagin the ſtocks and ſtones which they adored to be true Deities, but Images of the true God which he proves they adored by that text of S. Paul Acts. 17. *whom you ignorantly worſhip, him I declare unto you.* Whence its apparent the Idolatrie of the Iſraelits and Pagans did not conſiſt, ſaies he, in worſhipping fals Gods, but in worſhipping God in an Image againſt God's Ordinance; and this is our guilt, and wee are all Idolaters.

But Abulenſis, Chryſoſtom, S. Auguſtin, and aboue all the Scripture will comfort vs againſt our Dis diſcours; for Chryſoſt. hom. 5. de Pœnit. ſpeaking of the Iſraelits Idolatry ſaies; *After the people had heard thoſe words, I am they Lord they God, they made a Calf, they reiected God, they did not acknowledge him to be their God:* and as if he had foreſeen our Adverſaries difficultie, *how could ſuch wiſe men be ſo ſenſeleſs, as to believe a Calf made by themſelves to be a God*; he propoſes this queſtion in the ſame place; *If they were Gods, why did they ſay Make; how could thoſe be Gods which are made?* he anſwers, *Sic malitia excæcans ſibi ipſi repugnat, & ſeipſam extinguit; ſo blind is malice, that it contradicts itſelf, and refutes itſelf*: it was a contradiction, to be a *God*, and to *be made*; but their malice pinfolded their reaſon, that they owned both thoſe contradictions in their Calf: *Abulenſis* ſpeaks to the ſame purpoſe in Exod. c. 32. q. 3. and S. Auguſt. in pſal. 133. ſaies, *the wiſer ſort of Pagans adored Idols as the Vulgar did; but did not believe they were God's, but Images and Symbols of what they believed to be Gods*; and in the ſame place declares, what they

believed to be Gods ; *They give this interpretation of their Images ; by the Image Tellus, they ſignified the Earth ; by the Image Neptunus , the Sea ; by that of Iuno , the Air ; by that of Vulcan , the fire : and if you Vrge againſt them ; that then they worſhip Bodies for Gods , the Earth , the Sea &c. they anſwer they do not worſhip the Bodies themſelves , ſed quæ illis regendis præſident numina ; but the Deities and Spirits , which govern them bodies* : and in pſal. 69. he proves theſe Spirits were Deuils : But Scripture ſpeaks yet more plainly , Deut 32. 15. *They forſook the true God , they ſacrificed to the Devils not to God ; to Gods they knew not , to new Gods , that came newly vp , they forſook the true God who made them.*

By this you may ſee how much our Dr is miſtaken in ſaying the Iſraelits and Heathens Idolatrie conſiſted , not in adoring Images of fals Gods , but the true God in an Image ; for if you read S. Pauls ſpeech to the *Athenians* Act.17 24. you will find two things , firſt that they had ſom confuſed knowledge of *an only* and *true* Deitie , which appears by their Altar conſecrated *Ignoto Deo* to *the vnknowen God* : but this knowledge was ſo confuſed and erroneous , that

they believed this vnknowen God was like Gold or ſylver or ſtones, and the very text of S. Paul ſuppoſes they were in this opinion for he argues thus, *God who made the world and all things therin &c. therefore wee ought not to think that the Godhead is like to Gold or ſylver or ſtone graven by Art or man's device:* and therefore they were Idolaters becauſe they adored a God which they conceited to be as created things: Secondly it's apparent that beſids this *vnknowen God*, they adored alſo other Gods; for of them as of other Heathens S. Paul ſaid Rom. 1. 22. that the inviſible God being knowen by the Viſible creatures which are made, *They changed the glorie of the immortal God into an Image made like to corruptible man, and to birds and four footed beaſts, they changed the truth of God into a lie, and worſhipped and ſerved the Creatures more than the Creatour.* Their Idolatrie did conſiſt in that they adored theſe Creatures, Gold, ſylver, birds, four footed beaſts &c. not as Gods, for the wiſer Heathens were not ſo ſenſeleſs as to believe they were Gods; nor as Images of one, true, inviſible God, as Chriſtians believe, for you ſhall not

find among the Ancient Philoſophers any, who ſaies they adored One God; but as Images of fals Gods, who truly were but Devils or debauch wicked men, who cauſed themſelves to he adored: and this is evident, not only by the teſtimony of S. Auguſtin which I have quoted, but alſo by the teſtimonie of Arnobius contr. Gent. l. *6.* where you may reade the anſwer of the Heathen Philoſophers to Arnobius checking them for adoring ſtocks and ſtones: *You err, ſay they, O Arnobius in what you affirm; for wee do not think the matter of braſs, ſylver, and gold to be God and adorable Deities of themſelves: No wee are wiſer than ſo; but we honour and worſhip the Gods or Deities in thoſe ſacred Statues, whom the Virtue of ſacred Dedication hath brought into them, and made to dwell in thoſe Images made by Art:* You ſee Reader, what the Heathens adored; they adored the Images not for themſelves or any Deitie they ſhould have of themſelves; but for the *Gods* or *Deities*, which by *Sacred Dedication* were brought to lodge in them; and S. Auguſtin l. 8. de Civit. Dei c. 23. tells you, *that Sacred Dedication* was *Magical incantation*, by which the

Devils or wicked men's ſoules were *evocated*, and obliged to live in thoſe Statues. Judge you Reader what has this to do with our Worſhip of Images; and how far our Dr coms ſhort of prouing that the Adoration of the true God in an Image is Idolatrie.

He percloſes his 25. chapt. with an exclamation againſt our Church, for giuing adoration of *Latria* to Jmages, which error and Jdolatrous practice he ſaies has crept ſo much among our Vulgar people, and is countenanc'd by our learned men, rhat it would ſtrick a horror to you, if you did know the ſinfull abſurditie of it: and J do admire but it ſtricks a horror to our Drs. conſcience, to beguile his Reader with ſuch foul miſrepreſentatiõs of our Doctrin, and with ſuch willfull falſifications of our words and meaning; wheras he knows in his heart, our Adoration of *Latria* given to Chriſt's Image, is but Relative, not reſting in it, nor for its ſake, but paſſing to the Prototype which wee adore in it: as the honor don to the Kings Chair of ſtate, paſſes to the kings perſon, the reverence we have for the Bible, and the name of *Jeſus*; that David had to the Ark; the

Iſraëlits to the Braſen Serpent (before their Idolatrie) paſſes to God repreſented in them: for to prove vs grieveouſly Idolaters, you bring that Hymn of the Church to the Croſs

O Crux ave ſpes unica,
Hoc Paſſionis tempore,
Auge pïs juſtitiam,
Reiſque dona veniam.

And if this convinces vs of Idolatrie; what will you ſay of S. Auguſtin, who ſpeakes to the croſs thus, Serm. in Paraſc. *Crux nobis totius cauſa Beatitudinis eſt: hæc nos à cæcitate liberat erroris: hæc à tenebris reddidit luci: hæc alienos Deo conjunxit: hæc diſcordiæ amputatio eſt: hæc bonorum omnium abunda largitio, &c. The Croſs is the cauſe of all our bliſs; this croſs frees vs from blindneſs of error: it brought vs from darkneſs to light: it's it which cuts of all diſcord; it's it which vnits thoſe who are ſtrayed, to God; its the ſource of all goodneſs.* Know then Dr. that wee are no more Idolaters in adoring the croſs, than S. Auguſtin and innumerable other Saints whoſe words would be tedious to rehearſe.

✠

JHS.

XIX. CHAPTER.

ADORATION, AND INVOCATION OF Saints, no Idolatry.

OUr Dr often charges vs with *Idolatrie* for our Adoration of the Conſecrated Hoſt, for our Adoration of Images, and for our Adoration of Saints: to the two firſt parts of this accuſation we have anſwered; it remains we prove the Adoration of Saints to be no crime: and I cannot better prove it than by a Text which our Adverſaries frequently bring for to prove the vnlawfullneſs of this practice: when the Angel Revel. 19. appeared to S. John, the Apoſtle fell flat on the ground for to adore him; the Angel forbid him, ſaying he was his fellow ſervant: if the Adoration of an Angel or Saint be Idolatrie; therefore the Apoſtle was an Idolater; nay which is wors, a relaps Idolater; for again he fell on the ground to adore the Angel ch. 22. and the Angel prohibited him the ſecond

time : hence its manifeſt, that either the Apoſtle fell twice into Idolatrie or that adoration of Angels, and Saints is none : but ſay you why did the Angel forbid him? I anſwer, out of his reſpect to Human nature, ſince his Lord and king had aſſumed it : this reaſon S. Greg. gives, Hom. 8. in Evang. *Ante Redemptoris adventum, Angeli adorantur & iacent ; & poſtmodum adorari refugiunt ; quod naturam noſtram quàm prius deſpexerant, poſtquam illam ſupra ſe aſſumptam conſpiciunt, proſtratam ſibi videre pertimeſcunt. Before the coming of Chriſt, the Angels received adoration from men ; but after he took our Nature, they would not ſee proſtrated before them, that Nature which was exalted aboue them.* Or if this reaſon does not pleaſe you ; its ſufficient to my purpoſe to prove, he did not prohibit it becauſe it was Idolatrie ; for if you ſay the Angel did judge it to be Idolatrie ; I ſay the Apoſtle did judge it was not ; and in our inſtruction for God's Worship and Religion, wee are to believe the Apoſtle, rather than the Angel according the advice of S. Paul Gal. 1. 8. *tho an Angel from Heaven ſhould preach vn to you an other Ghoſpel, than that*

which we have preached, let him be accurſed.

The Invocation of Saints I have proved in the *Vnerring Vnerrable Church* by ſeveral Paſſages of Scripture, convincing that Saints departed from this life know our affaires on earth, that they pray for vs; that many have received favours and bleſſings by their interceſſion: I pray Reader read my diſcourſe there, and ſpare me the labour of repeating it; and you will admire the courage of my Adverſarie who complains, as if he had juſtice and reaſon on his ſyde, that I do not anſwer his arguments vpon this ſubject; and not one argument does he bring either in his Sermon, or book, but that text of S. Peter Act. 4. *that there is no ſalvation in any other but Ieſus Chriſt; nor any other name vnder Heaven given among men whereby wee may be ſaued*: where he concludes, we cannot aſk the mediation of Saints, without robbing Chriſt of his prerogative of Mediatorſhip. It's not pardonable in him to repeat again, what has been ſo cleerly anſwered, as my Reader may ſee in my former Treatiſe: in hopes we may never any more

hear of this thredbare ſtorie, let him take this ſyllogiſm: We believe the Vnity of Chriſt's Deyty, as much as the Vnitie of his Mediatorſhip: but its not againſt our belief of his Deitie, to call the Saints, as well of Heaven, as of earth Gods; for David calls all Juſt men Gods: *I ſay yee are all Gods, and the ſons of the higheſt all*, therefore its not againſt our belief of his Mediatorſhip, that wee ſhould call the Saints, as well in heaven, as on earth, our Mediators: and who does not ſee the weakneſs of our Drs diſcourſe; for if becauſe Chriſt is our only Mediator, we muſt not aſk the prayers of the Saints in heaven; neither muſt we aſk any Mediator on earth, which is evidently againſt the practice of all congregations; for we aſk one an other to pray for vs: *But how come this argument to prove*, (ſaies our Dr) *as I. S. pretends, that we muſt not aſk the prayers of the Saints on earth.* Did ever Logician make the like Quere? do not you pretend by the text, that Chriſt is our *onely* Mediator becauſe there is no other name vnder Heauen (thats to ſay on earth) where by we may be ſaued? if therefore the text proves any thing againſt

againſt the mediation of Saints, it proves againſt the mediation of the Saints *vnder* heaven, that's to ſay on earth. We acknowledge, as I have ſaid in my former Treatiſe, Chriſt to be our onely Mediator by *Redemption*, becauſe he alone did, and was able by his death to reconcile vs to God, and redeem vs; but he is not our only Mediator by *interceſſion*, becauſe others pray for vs; tho he in a far more excellent degree.

He perceived it ſeems the weakneſs of this charge, and quits it; and runs all along vpon an other point, proving our exceſs in our devotion and worſhip of Saints; and all he brings to prove it, is reduced to three heads, and all three have not one dram of brains; the firſt is his Prudence, that for ought we know many of thoſe we eſteem Saints, are wicked and damn'd wretchs; therefore we muſt not pray to any Saint: I hope he does not meane the B. Virgin, nor the Apoſtles, nor S. Auguſtin, S. Hierom, and ſuch others; let him therefore give vs leaue to pray to them; and let him point out what Saint is he, of thoſe whom we worſhip, of whoſe San-

titie we have not as much assurance; as we have of S. Augustin and S. Hierom; and then we will not worship them: but to say we must pray to none: because som reputed Saints are not such; is as much as if you did say, we must not esteem and honor any men on earth for their great Virtue and learning, because som reputed to be Virtuous and learned, are but Hypocrits and Idiots. The second excess is that we build more Churches to Saints than to God; and he will not take our answer, that what Churchs we build to the Saints, we build them to God, because its for his sake we honor the Saints: for saies he, *if a king did constitut his Son Sollicitor general for his Subjects, it would not be well taken by the king, that the Subjects should make their application to the Servants in Court, neglecting their application to the Prince*: but Dr what if the king were disposed to honor, not only his son, but also the Servants at Court for his Son's sake (if any man serves me, my father will honor him Jo. 12.) if he decreed to grant whatever his son would ask, for his Subjects, and not only what himself would ask, but what

any of the Servants in Court would aſk in his name : certainly the power of the ſon would be the greater.

The third exceſs is , that we call the B. Virgin our *Savioureſs*, our *Redeemereſs*; deſperat expreſſions he ſaies , againſt the text of S. Peter which ſayes, there is no name vnder heaven whereby we can be ſaved , but that of Jeſus Chriſt : Theſe indeed are deſperat expreſſions in the meaning you take them , but not in the meaning our Church gives them : if you go to the Dictionarie , or the Grammer to looke for the ſenſe of thoſe words , you may render our Doctrin and practice ridicule ; but if you go to the Church , and be inform'd in what ſenſe ſhe takes them , you will find they are religious : God calls Moyſes the *God of Pharao* ; if you take the word in its proper and vſual ſignification , its a blaſphemy , wherof I hope you will not accuſe God : David calls the Juſt , *Gods and the Sons of the Heigheſt* ; a deſperat expreſſion if you take the words in their gramatical ſenſe , but religious , if you take them in David's meaning : The great Baptiſt was not the *Light* , but a *witneſs of the Light* , ſaies the Evangeliſt ;

Chriſt was *the true Light for to illuminat the world*; yet Chriſt himſelf calls his ſervants *the light of the world*; is this a deſperat expreſſion? Chriſt is the only foundation of the Church, ſaies S. Paul, yet in Revel: c. 21. wee read the twelve Apoſtles are the twelve foundations of the Cittie of God: you will not ſtick to ſay Chriſt is the only Mediator and reconciliator of Man with God, as S. Paul ſayes; and yet Wisd. c. 4. *Noe* is called not only *Reconciliator*, but the *Reconciliation* betwixt God and man: And you muſt acknowledge theſe expreſſions are not deſperat in the ſenſe and meaning of thoſe who vttered them, tho in a gramatical ſenſe they may be: ſo you muſt confeſs the expreſſion of *Savioureſs*, *Redeemereſs* &c. are Catholic and Religious in the ſenſe of the Church, which is not any other, but that the B. Virgin is the chief inſtrument after Chriſt for our Redemption: Do we call her *Redeemereſs*? wee ſpeake with S. Cyril, Hom. cont. Neſt. *By thee Holy Mother of God, all creatures that worſhipped Idols have been converted to the knowledge of truth: praiſe be to thee, O Holy Trinitie; praiſe be to thee alſo o B.*

Virgin. Do wee call her, *Queen of Heaven, glorie and happineſs of mankind?* wee ſpeake with Greg. Nazian. in Trag. Chriſ. Mor. to. 2. pag. 298. *You who are juſtly ſeated aboue all the celeſtial Hierarchies, Queen, Miſtreſs, and happineſs of human kind.* Do we ſay, *Haile B. Virgin thou alone haſt deſtroied all Hereſies*, wee have heard S. Cyril ſay as much: ſeek not then, Dr by your *bug-bears* of *deſperat expreſſions*, to beat vs from our Devotion to her; we ſpeake with the Prophet David, we ſpeake with the Ancient Fathers of the Church, we ſpeake with God himſelf.

And it is but a peece of your accuſtomed confidence to ſay, that in the firſt ages there was no mention of this worſhip of Saints: you have heard S. Cyril, and Greg. Nazian. hear yet S. Auguſtin cont. fauſtum, l. 20. c. 21. *Fauſtus checks vs for honoring the memorie of our Martirs, ſaying we change God, into Idols: but we Chriſtians do celebrat the memorie of our Martirs with religious ſolemnitie, for to ſtir vs vp to their imitation; for to partake of their merits, and for to be help'd by their prayers; but ſo as that we do not offer ſacrifice to the Martirs; but to the God*

of Martirs in memorie of them. S. Ambroſe de viduis l. 4. ſpeaking of S. Peter and S. Andrew's prayer for their Mother in law; *What then they did for her, by reaſon of their kinred, now they can do for vs, and for all, we muſt pray to the Saints, we muſt pray to the Martirs, from whom we may expect protection and favor, having with vs the pledges of their bodies, they can pray for the remiſſion of our ſins; the Martirs of God are our Protectors, and ſpectators of our lyves and actions.* S. Vict Utic. l. 3. de Perſec. Vand. having praied to the Angels to repreſent vnto God the miſeries of Africk, he addreſſes his Prayers to the Saints. *Pray, Patriarks from whoſe ſeed the Church Springs, which now is perſecuted; pray, o Prophets who ſee the Church of whom you prophecied, now ſo diſtreſſed; intercede, O Apoſtles for that Church which you eſtabliſht by your labours; and in particular O Peter, pray for that flock which your Maſter recommended to you.* Nay our Dr in the end of his chapter quotes the teſtimonie of Origen contr. Celſ. l. 5. and ſaies, that by Origen's words it appears, how Angels do aſſiſt vs, and pray for vs; the teſtimonie of Origen ends thus (it would be tedious to repeate it wholy)

when men pray vnto God, many thousands of the sacred powers pray together with them vncalled for; and our Dr very wittily picks vp that word, *vncalled for*, and argues thence, that the Angels and Saints do indeed pray for vs, but that we must not aſk them to do ſo; becauſe, they pray for vs *vncalled for*; if you call to them to pray for you, you'l ſpoile all, if you believe our Dr; but believe S. Gregorie rather, who aduiſes you to pray vnto, and call the Saints to aſſiſt you; ſpeaking of the laſt Judgment; *In illo conventu cauſa noſtra diſcutitur, & tamen nos patronos modo non requirimus, quos tunc defenſores habeamus; adſunt defenſores noſtri Sancti Martires; rogari volunt, & quærunt vt quærantur: hos ergo adjutores veſtris orationibus quærite; hos protectores veſtri reatus invenite, quia ne punire peccatores debeat, rogari vult & ipſe qui judicat.* Hom. 32. in Evang. *In that great meeting our cauſe will be examin'd and we do not now ſeeke Patrons, who then may defend vs: the Holy Martyrs are our Protectors; they deſire to be intreated; they aſk, that they may be aſked; aſk them therefore to aſſiſt your prayers; procure they intercede for your ſins, for he who is to be the judge of*

ſinners, deſires he be praied not to puniſh them.

XX. CHAPTER.

PVRGATORIE AND INDVLGENCES.

I Thought I had don my Dr a kindneſs in aſſerting a Purgatorie in the other life, where he might be ſo happy as to ſoiourn a whyle; for he may go further, and ſpeed worſe. But he has met ſom what in my former diſcourſe vpon this point that has nettl'd him; for he powers out ſuch a deluge of injuries againſt me, that you would think he dipt his pen in Gall. No, hee'l not heare ſpeake of a Purgatorie; he is reſolu'd not to ſtop or ſtand in the road; if God will not haue Heauen's gates open for him at his departure from this life, hee'l take vp his lodging in hell. *Let not I. S ſaies he, expect to put me of with ſtratagems of ſchooleboyes, I muſt keep him to the point: the point is whether the teſtimonies of Scripture alledged by your Church be convincing prooſes of the exiſtence of a Purga-*

torie : This indeed is to ſpeake like a Maſter; but you'l ſee hee'l com of like a ſchool boy : what is *the Point* Dr ? *whether the texts alleaged by our Church be convincing proofs of Purgatorie* : I told you, how he would com of : what ? we loudly profeſs that our Rule of faith is not Scripture alone ; that tho there were no convincing text of Scripture, yet we are obliged to believe Purgatorie vpon the teſtimonie of our infallible Church interpreting Scripture; and yet you will tell vs the Point is, if our text alledged be convincing ? No Dr, you have miſtaken the point ; The point is, why you forſook the Catholic Church and became a Proteſtant ? you ſay, for our Errors, wherof Purgatorie is one; you vndertook in your Sermon to prove theſe Errors by plain and cleer Scripture : *let me keep you to the point* Dr; let vs ſee your cleer and plain texts denying Purgatorie : you whoſe Rule of faith is *Scripture alone*, which, you ſay, cleerely ſhewes our Errors; you are to be demanded cleer and plain texts to prove ther's no Purgatorie : but we are not to be challeng'd to produce convincing texts, becauſe our

Rule of faith is not Scripture alone; but Scripture as interpreted by the Church; ſo its ſufficient for vs to produce a text, which the Church interprets to import the exiſtence of a Purgatorie.

You have quite ſweru'd from the point Dr, the point was to ſhew by convincing texts, that there is no other receptacle of ſoules in the other world but *Heaven* and *Hell* of the damned, as you ſay, grounded vpon that text, *where the Tree falls there it ſhall remain*: for I proved convincingly there is an other place, by S. Peter 1. Epiſt. 7. 19 ſpeaking of Chriſt's deſcent into hell, he ſaies; *Dead in fleſh, and quickned in Spirit he deſcended to the Spirits which were detained in priſon* (there was a Priſon therefore, where Spirits were detained) *to preach vnto them* (certainly it was not to the damn'd ſouls he went to preach) *which he releaſed, leading Captivity Captive*, ſaies S. Paul. Epheſ. 4. 8. (ſure it was not the damn'd ſoules he releaſed) why did not you anſwer to this text Dr? you clapt it vnder deck, becauſe it was the Point; and it you reſolved not to touch. The point alſo was, to examin if after the ſin is forgiven, either by Confeſſion,

or perfect Contrition ; the ſinner remains ſtill lyable to Gods juſtice for ſom temporal puniſhment ; and in caſe he died before he diſcharged that debt, if there was not a priſon in the other world , where the ſoule ſhould be detained vntill it paid to the laſt farthing ; this I proved by the Goſpel, and ſeveral paſſages of Scripture : why did not you anſwer ? no it was a naughtie card that ſpoyl'd your game, you dropt it aſide,and to divert your Reader,you make Heaven a Receptacle of ſoules actually polluted with ſins, ſaying, that with their infamous ſins they may enter thither ; and bring no proof for this paradox, quite oppoſit to the text, and ſentiments of all the Chriſtian world, but a paſſage of Origen which you fouly miſinterpret. The point was to examin the true ſence of the Article of our Creed *He deſcended into Hell* ; what Hell was that ? the Grave as ſom of your fraternitie abſurdly interpret ; or the Hell of the damned , as Calvin and many of your authentic Catechiſms interpreted, ſaying he ſuffered the pains of the damned ; or ſom part of Hell where ſoules were detained in priſon expecting their

Redemption: you pretend to fob vs of with a tale of a tub, that ſom ſaie, that Article was not in the Creed in the firſt four hundred years; I will not diſpute this point, becauſe it matters not if it was or not; ſince that now it is, and owned by vs, as well as by you; then you would render my diſcourſe inſignificant, as if my argument were, *He deſcended into Hell, therefore there is a Purgatorie*, which conſequence you ſay is ridiculous; and ſo it is indeed; but it's of your own making, you ſhall not find it in J.S. His conſequence goes thus; *He deſcended into Hell, according our Creed, to preach to thoſe who were in priſon, according S. Peter; to releaſe them; leading Captivitie Captiue according S. Paul; therefore there is a Priſon in Hell, where ſoules were in reſtraint; where Chriſt preached; whence he releaſed captives*: is this the Hell of the damned think you? and if it be a third place, diſtinct from Heaven and Hell of the damned, what will become of your Doctrin, which denies Purgatorie, chiefly becauſe ſay you the *Tree* muſt fall to either of thoſe two places? This was the point you ſhould have ſtuck vnto Dr and not to rattle at

J. S. and keep a buſtle about the texts of Scripture which he quoted, and which the reader will cleerly ſee you have not anſwered, if he faces your replies with my diſcourſe vpon them.

And tho, as I ſaid, wee had no convincing text for this, or our other Tenets; our Doctrin ſtands vnſhaken vpon the teſtimonie of our Church, and vpon the vnanimous conſent of precedent ages: wee are in poſſeſſion of this Doctrin theſe 1600. yeares; our long poſſeſſion ſufficiently credits our Doctrin; you are Aggreſſors, you muſt bring evident proofs againſt vs; as Defendants; its our duty but to anſwer to your allegations: But my Dr replies, that they are Defendants of their libertie; that we are Actors who inuade their libertie and impoſe vpon them Doctrins which are not in the Word of God: yee *Defendants*, Dr and not Actors? who were born but yeſterday, who puſht vs out of our Churchs and eſtates for our Doctrin: you ſay we inuade your libertie can you have any libertie for not believing a Doctrin wherof the world was poſſeſſed for ſo many ages? It's you who inuade our Libertie, by for-

cing vpon vs the belief of two Sacraments, a figurative preſence, &c. never yet knowen in the Orthodox Church, and we muſt ſtand for our Libertie, vntill you produce Gods Word to prove it: but the Ancient poſſeſſion of our Doctrin is ſufficient to maintain vs in it; and you can have no libertie for to deny it, vntill you prove the poſſeſſion to be injuſt: you ſay our poſſeſſion may by queſtion'd, and if we do not prove our, Title our poſſeſſion will be forfeited: And if we ſhould forfeit our Poſſeſſion, I would gladly know, what are Proteſtants the neerer to prove theirs to be the true Church or Doctrin? The Arrians and Pelagians will have as good a claim to it as you: But Dr we have allready proved our Title: we were once put in poſſeſſion of the true Doctrin by Chriſt: this is our Title, and this you confeſs becauſe you ſay we were once the true Church: now its your dutie to prove we fell from that Doctrin, and vntill you prove this evidently our Poſſeſſion is juſt, and our Doctrin muſt be believed.

You are much pleaſed with that Scholaſtical ſubtilitie, that prayers for the

dead (which you allow to be commendable) may be made for other ends, than for to draw Soules out of the fire of Purgatorie ; becauſe ſay you, that God forſeeing the prayers which in future times will be made for perſons deceaſed, as he is infinitly liberal and good, may anticipat the reward of thoſe prayers, to the benefit of the Perſons prayed for ; by giuing them a good death ; And our Dr according his old mode ſaies not a word of my anſwer to this diſcourſe, which my Reader, if he reads my former Treatiſe, will find to be ſatisfactorie and ſolid ; it would be tedious to repeate it: but let me aſk one queſtion of my Adverſarie : does he ſeriouſly believe, that the Jews knew this ſchool ſubtilitie ? they praied for the dead, as I have proved, and certainly they knew not that quillet ; but their practice was regulated by their beliefe, that ſoules depart from this life often times with ſins, which muſt be expiated in the other world, which the very Text ſignifies *vt a peccatis ſolvantur*. Nor is it credible, that the practice of the Church for ſo many ages ſhould be grounded on ſo weak a bottom, as that

ſubtilitie of ſom few Modern Divins, which probably may be fals. I do not ſee what this ſchool ſubtility may be good for, but for to comfort our Dr's cõſcience in a ſcruple which he ought to have; for if he believes ther's no Purgatory from whence ſouls may be releaſed, then he is obliged in conſciẽce to reſtore all the monies he received whylſt he lived in the Catholic Church, for to pray for ſouls in Purgatory and their releaſe from thence; for, his being of a perſwaſion that there was a purgatorie when he received the monies, does not excuſe him now from the obligation of reſtitution, ſince he is convinced ther's none; but I do fear our Dr will not be ſoon perſwaded to reſtore that monie; probably he will tell vs the Perſons he prayed for, got a good death by his Prayers.

But to ſtrick the nail in the head, we will prove that Prayers for the dead have been practiſed by the Church and Ancient Fathers directly for this end, to draw Soules our of the fire of Purgatorie: S. Gregorie in *Pſalm.* 3. *Pœnit. Scio futurum eſſe* &c. *I know that after this life ſom will be cleanſed by the fire of Purgatorie;*

others will be eternally damn'd. And in Pſal. 1. *poſt mortem carnis alij æternis deputantur ſupliciis, alij ad vitam per ignem tranſeunt purgationis: after the death of our body, ſom are deputed to eternal tormenis; ſom to life, do paſs by the fire of purgatorie.* Again S. Greg. Dial. l. 4. c. 39. *for ſome ſmale faults wee muſt believe there is a purging fire, before the day of judgment: And after hauing reckoned ſome ſmale venial ſins*, he ads, *quæ cuncta etiam poſt mortem gravant, ſi adhuc in hac vita poſitis, non fuerunt relaxata. All which are a loade vpon the ſoule euen after death, if they be not forgiven whyle wee are in this life.* And again Dial. l. 4. c. 25. *Sunt quorumdam Iuſtorum animæ, quæ à cæleſti regno, quibuſdam adhuc manſionibus differuntnr, in quo dilationis damno, quid aliud innuitur, niſi quod de perfecta juſtitia aliquid minus habuerunt: Some Soules there are of Iuſt men, which are kept out of heaven for a time in certain habitations; by which puniſhment of delay, what is ſignified, but that ſomwhat was wanting to them, to be perfectly Iuſt.* Theodoret in Schol. Græcis in 1. Corint. 3. *Hunc Purgatorium ignem &c. Wee believe this purging fire, wherin the ſoule departed will be tried and purged as Gold in the fournace. S. Greg.*

Niſſ. Orat. pro mortuis: Vel in præſenti vita &c. *Man muſt be cleanſed in this life; or after his death muſt be purged by the fournace of purgatorie fire:* S. Auguſt. in Pſalm. 39. & l. 2. de Civit. Dei. c. 16. & c. 24. and in ſeveral other places ſpeakes expreſly of the fire of Purgatorie after this life, through which the ſoules departed muſt paſs to be cleanſed: hear him l. 1. de Gen. cont. Manich. c. 20. *Qui forte agrum*, &c. *He that has not cultivated his field in this world; in the other life muſt go either to the fire of Purgatorie, or to the fire of Hell.* Now Dr remember that pag. 182. you grant with Origen, that Soules departing carrie with them ſom ſtains of ſins and notes of infamy; you will have me believe with Origen, as you ſay, (but Origen in his words which you quote ſaies no ſuch thing) that the Soules carrie theſe ſtains and notes of infamy with them to Heaven; expreſly againſt the Word of God, who ſaies, no polluted thing ſhall enter thither: let the Reader judge if it be not more juſt, more reaſonable, and more ſuitable to the opinion all Chriſtians have of Gods averſion to the leaſt ſin; and of the puritie and cleanneſs of that Heavenly

Cittie, that I ſhould believe, S. Aug. S. Gregor. Theodoret, and innumerable other Fathers, which, to ſhun tediouſneſs, I paſs in ſilence, who affirm, that thoſe ſoules which carrie with them ſtains and ſins to the other life, muſt be cleanſed and purged by a purging fire before they can enter into Heaven; than to believe Origen (tho he ſhould ſay it, as he does not) who ſaies they will carrie thoſe ſtains and ſins with them thither.

From Purgatorie he coms to attack our Tenet of Indulgences; and that you may ſee with how little juſtice, I will declare briefly our Doctrin in this point: firſt it's an vnqueſtionable Veritie, that any one, of the many penal works performed by Chriſt, was ſufficient for the Redemption of this, and many other world's, one drop of his blood was of infinit merit; whence it appears, that by the great heape of ſatisfactorie and penal works, which he exerciſed in this world, he exhibited an infinitly greater ſatisfaction for our redemption than was needfull: alſo it's apparent, that the many penal works of the B. Virgin, of the Apoſtles and

innumerable other Saints, were a greater ſatisfaction for their ſins and imperfections, than was needfull to expiat them and ſatisfie Gods juſtice; and this we learn by *Iob's* words c. 6 v. 2. *Vtinam appenderentur peccata mea quibus iram merui; & calamitas quam patior in ſtatera, quaſi arena maris hæc gravior appareret. O! that my ſins for which I deſerved anger and the calamitie which I ſuffer, were weighed in a balance; as the ſands of the Sea, this* (my calamitie) *would appear greater.* Of theſe ſuperabundant ſatisfactions of Chriſt and Saints workes, wee ſay there is a treaſure in the Church; for certainly thoſe works, though needleſs for the *Workers*, are not without value and eſteem in Gods ſight; and are not fruitleſs to the Church; for that Article of our Creed, *the Communion of Saints*, imports that the faithfull do partake, and benefit by the good works one of an other; *Particeps ego ſum timentium te, & cuſtodientium mandata tua*, ſaies the Prophet David Pſ. 118. *I am a partaker of the works of thoſe who feare you, and keep your Commandments*; and ſo we muſt ſay, that thoſe ſuperabundant ſatisfactorie penal works of Chriſt and

his Saints, are a treaſure of the Church, wherof the faithfull do partake: And thus we expound how they partake of it: Tho the ſin, whether Mortal or Venial, be remitted by Confeſſion, or Contrition; yet a temporal puniſhment remains due of the ſinner to Gods Juſtice, which I proved by Scripture and reaſon in my former Treatiſe, for the Penitent muſt not only ſatisfie the pennance enjoyned by the Confeſſor, but we are exhorted to other penal works and pennances for to ſatisfie for our ſins: and therefore by the Ancient Canons of the Church, great and ſevere penances were impoſed, according the qualitie of the ſin; ſom of ſeaven years pennance; others of more; others of leſs: theſe penal works the Penitents muſt perform; or ſom other muſt perform them for him, if he be not in a capacitie to do it; becauſe Gods juſtice muſt be ſatisfied, who as he mercifully remits the eternal pains due for our ſins, by virtue of the Sacraments, ſo he requires a temporal puniſhment for to ſatisfie his juſtice: This ſatisfaction may be made either by the Penitent himſelf, by exerciſing as much penal

works in this life, or ſuffering in Purgatorie, as much as is due of him for to ſatisfie Gods juſtice; Or by offering to God, and applying to that Penitent, as much of the treaſure of Chriſt, and Saints ſatisfaction and penal works as he owes.

This then wee call Indulgence, *A remiſſon of the temporal pains due of man to God's juſtice, through the merits and ſatisfactions of Chriſt and his Saints applied to him.* Which Indulgence and application of thoſe merits and ſatisfaction, wee ſay is in the power of the Pope; for thoſe ſuperabundant ſatisfactions and penal works of Chriſt and his Saints, being a treaſure of the Church, and appliable to the vſe and benefit of the faithfull, as we have diſcourſed; to whom ſhould the diſtribution, of that treaſure belong, but to the Prince, Chief Steeward, and Governor of the Church; to him to whom the keyes were given to open and lock, to bind and unbind? Nor are theſe Indulgences appliable only to the living, but alſo to the Soules departed: for, as when one is in priſon for a debt, for to get out, and the creditor to be indemnified, the

Priſoner muſt pay the debt out of his own purſe, or ſom one muſt pay it for him: ſo when a ſoule departs this life, either with Venial ſins only, or without having don pennance ſufficient for the mortal ſins forgiven him by the Sacrament; he muſt pay to Gods juſtice the temporal Puniſhment which he ows, and this is don either by *Satispaßion* ſuffering the pains of Purgatorie for a certain time; or by the ſuffrages and penal works of the Living which they apply to him; or by Indulgence, applying from the treaſure of the Church, that's of the ſuperabundant Satisfaction of Chriſt and his Saints, as much as will anſwer to the pains which they are to ſuffer there.

It's certain, the Pope muſt have a cauſe, and as ſom ſay proportionable to the quantity of the Indulgence he grants; for want of which, the grant would be null; which gives occaſion to our Adverſaries to ſnarle, as our Dr Sall does, againſt the profuſneſs of the Pope, for granting Plenary Indulgences for euery trifle, as they ſay: but in this they ſpeake immodeſtly, and temerariouſly; firſt becauſe it's an in-

tolerable arrogance in Subjects to expostulat against their Prince, and accuse him of prodigality, when he expends the treasure of the kingdom to the advantage of his Subjects, because forsooth they do not cõceive nor know, whether the Princes design be advantagious or not: its the Dutie of a subject to believe the king has just reasons to do what he does, if the contrary does not evidently appear: so its our dutie to believe the Pope has a just cause for granting Indulgences, when he grants them; for tho the motive he has, may seem to you or to me to be but smale aud insufficient; yet it may be in itself weightie and great: and at least we are in charitie obliged to believe, that he thinks the cause he has, is just and proportionable to his grant; and that his intention is not, said Indulgence should be valuable further than as the causes deserves it.

Our Drs reflexion, that these grants are a powerfull means to facilitat sins, is vulgar, and answered in my former Treatise, where I shewed how the Protestant Principles do much more facilitat them, wheras they require no

more for to be cleans'd of them, but a *Lord have mercy vpon me* betwixt the ſinner and God; when to the contrary for a good Confeſſion, ſo many things are required by vs; and for obtaining Indulgences, beſides Confeſſion and Communion; alms, prayers, and other pious exerciſes: all the Dr has beſids in his diſcourſe of Indulgences, is but rallery, and ſport vpon our Diviſions of Indulgences, and a *Bull* of Indulgences, granted by Clement the X. which he has tranſlated into Engliſh, lykely to oblige the *Coffie* houſe Maſter, with a ſubject of merriment for his Cuſtomers: and it may be feared, that in time our Dr may give his profane Reader more ſport; for if, as Ochinus, of a Capuchin Fryar became a Reformed, and from the Reformation paſs'd to be a Jew, and ſeveral other revolted Prieſts and Fryars, of Calviniſts, became Turks and Jews; if I ſay our Dr ſhould chance, as he renounced the Catholic faith, to renounce alſo Proteſtancy for Paganiſm or Judaiſm, he will as eaſilie ieer the practices and Doctrin of Chriſtianity, as now he does them of Popery.

XXI. CHAPTER.

A BRIEF SVRVEY OF HIS FOVR LAST Chapters.

IN his 31. Chap. of prayers in an vnknowen language, he points his arrows ſo vnfixedly, that we know not what he would be at; ſomtimes he would have it to be abſolutly needfull, the *Lyturgie* ſhould be in a language vnderſtood by the people; leaſt they may anſwer *Amen* to a knave, who would vtter blaſphemies: and not a ſillable does he anſwer to my reply, that if the Lyturgie muſt be in a language vnderſtood by the Auditory; then the *Dutch*, and *French*, who do not vnderſtand Engliſh, muſt not go to the Proteſtant Lyturgie; and the Deaf, and ſuch as are at ſo great a diſtance from the Miniſter, as not to hear him, muſt quit the Congregation; nay if the Miniſter does not vnderſtand the pſalms, through the intricatneſs of their Phraſes (and but few Miniſters do) he muſt return home and

ſom of the neighbours, more learned than he, muſt officiat for him.

Somtimes he pretends only a greater advantage and Spiritual comfort of the flock, for the increaſe of devotion in praying in a knowen language; but the way for to prove this, would be to convince the world, that Proteſtants are more devout than Roman Catholics; and I thank God the world is convinced of the contrary: ther's nothing more ſure, than that the frequent vſe of prayers, is a mark and ſign of devotion in praying; ther's none more aſſiduous in praying, than he who feels ſpiritual comfort, and conſolation in them; he who finds but tepidity and coolneſs, praies but ſeldom: now, it's viſible, our Catholic Church praies a hundred fold more than yours: you meet in your Churchs but vpon Sundaies, and ſom other od daies in the year; the other daies of the week, your Churchs are ſhut vp; or if open, they ſerve but for a walking place, or for boyes to plaie at Ball: and if in ſom few Citties, a few Churchs are open, (and they are but very few) for Wedneſday and friday prayers, your congregations are ſo thin,

that ther's hardly any to anſwer *Amen* to the Miniſter; Our Congregations are numerous every day in the week, our Churchs very many conſtantly open, frequently aſſiſted, not onely by a multitude of the Clergy, eſpecially in the Cathedral Churchs, and Convents of Fryars and Nuns, morning and Evening, and at midnight ſinging Gods prayſes; but by a numerous multitude of our Layety: is not the Pomp and Majeſtie of Divin ſervice in ourChurch, our frequent Proceſſions, our many holy daies, a mark that wee pray more frequently than you? and a frequent cuſtom of praying, being a viſible mark of devotion, as I have ſaid; its Viſible our Church and flock has more devotion in Latin, than yours in Engliſh.

I proved prayers in any language to be lawfull in itſelf; becauſe the intent of nature when wee ſpeake, is that the hearer may vnderſtand vs; when wee pray, God is our Hearer, and not the congregation; its to him wee ſpeake; and wheras he vnderſtands all languages, wee may pray in any: Our Dr fancies, that this argument proves directly againſt me; *becauſe*, ſaies he,

the Lyturgy is an exchange of ſpeech betwixt God and his people; he ſpeakes to them in the Epiſtle, Ghoſpel and pſalms; and the people are the Hearers; they ſpeake to God in prayers, and thanks giving: Gods ſpeech therefore muſt be in a language vnderſtood by the people who are the Hearers: But Sr tho the Ghoſpel, Epiſtles, and pſalms be Gods ſpeech to the people, I hope you will not ſay, its a prayer of God to the people; to what purpoſe then do you bring this inſtance? for the queſtion now debated is, *If Prayers muſt be in a knowen language:* But ſaies he, tho it be not a Prayer of God to the people, its an exhortation of his, and I confeſs, with S. Paul, that the exhortations to the people muſt be in a language knowen to them becauſe they are the *hearers*: Neither in this do you hit right Dr; God is not the immediat inſtructor of the people; he inſtructs and exhorts vs by the Miniſters and Paſtors of the Church; the Ghoſpell therefore, Epiſtle, leſſons, and pſalms in the Lyturgie, are not properly Gods exhortation to the Congregation, but a ſubject and matter for the Paſtor or Miniſter for an exhortation to the people; and for to prove

this its enough, that beſides the Lyturgy, you have in your Churchs, Sermons and exhortations when you meet on the Sabaoth day; its needleſs therefore the Epiſtle, Goſpel, leſſons, and Pſalms be in a knowen language, becauſe they are not intended in the Lyturgy for an immediat exhortation to the people; but for a Subject or argument for the Miniſter to exhort vpon: its evident they are a part of the Lyturgy, which is a prayer of the people to God; the peoples prayer as wee proved may be in any language; becauſe God, who is the Hearer, vnderſtands any: therefore the Epiſtle, Ghoſpel, leſſons and pſalms may be in any language the Church pleaſes. And it is preſumption in any privat Perſon, as *Luther* and *Sall*, or in any particular Province or Congregation, to alter the language preſcribed by the Church vnder pretence of a ſpiritual advantage or increaſe of devotion; the Church, and not any privat Perſon or Gongregation, being the guide and Miſtreſs which God has appointed, as we have proved, for to teach vs, what rites, ceremonies and manner of Worſhip we are to ſerve

him with: but our Dr ſaies, its an abſurd thing, that J. S. ſhould pretend wee ſhould ſubmit our judgments in this to the Church, *our preſent buſineſs*, quoth he, *being to check the abuſes of the Church*: and juſt ſo will the Preſbiterians and Quakers anſwer, its a ridiculous thing in the Proteſtants to aſk them to conform themſelves with the Church of England, becauſe their buſineſs is, to check the abuſes of that Church.

In his 32. Chap. he pretends to prove its cruelty to forbid our common people from reading Scripture, and magnifies the happineſs his flock reapes from the contrary practice; and ſaies not a word to this purpoſe, but what I refuted in my former Treatiſe: but alas! the lamentable effects of this arbitrary reading and interpretation of Scripture, are but too viſible; and he might have better called it the ſparke of Hell fire, which kindled and conſerves the combuſtions of our Chnrch and ſtate, than our Obedience to the Pope: his vulgar reproach of our Diviſions and diſtinctions of Rites and Ceremonies, among Dominicans, Franciſcans, and Jeſuits, is not worth the taking

notice of; it was want of matter for to fill his Chapter made him ſtoop to ſo trivial an inſtance.

His attempt in his 33. chapt. againſt the Immaculat Conception of the B. Virgin, is no more, than what he ſaid in his Sermon and I refuted in my former Treatiſe: The words of S. Auguſtin quoted by me to prove the obligation of confeſſing, not only every ſin wee are guiltie of, but the circumſtances of time, place, and qualitie of the Perſons, with whom wee commit them, ſtartles him: he will not believe I have the leaſt tincture of a Divin, or that I am acquainted, or was ever bred among learned men of the Roman Church; and very reſolutly ſaies, that our Divins teach, its not the duty of a penitent to confeſs the circumſtances of time, place and quality of the perſons, wherin and wher with the ſin was committed: and no man of judgment will ever aſk a better proof for to believe, that our Doctor never was a *Profeſſor of Moral Divinity*, nor that he ever read any of their works, or if he did, that he had not the memorie of a Chick to retain what he read: for he might have

mt

met in Alexan. 3. p. q. 32. art 2. Anton. 2. p. tit. 9. c. 7. Roſel. Verbo Confeſſio. n. 7. and in ſeveral other ancient Authors, that a ſin committed in the Sabaoth day, takes a particular malice againſt the Virtue of *Religion*, from the circumſtance of the time: becauſe its a profanation of a day conſecrated to the Worſhip of God; and ought to be ſpecified in Confeſſion: this Doctrin is now abſolet: but as to the circumſtances of the place and qualitie of the Perſons, it has been allwaies, and is ſtill the Doctrin of all Divins, that there is an obligation of Confeſſing them; It's theft to ſteale out of a Merchants ſhop; but its a ſacriledge to ſteale out of a Church; nor will you ſatisfie the dutie of a Penitent by ſaying you ſtole; if you do not mention that you ſtole out of a Church. Its Murther to kill, but if you kill a Prieſt, its a ſacriledge, and you muſt expreſs it in your Confeſſion: but I do not wonder our Dr ſhould not minch, nor chaw theſe diſtinctions of ſins and circumſtances; ſince he is becom of the Church of England, acuſtomed for ſo many years, to plunge its hands in the blood of the Clergy,

and ryfle Altars and Churchs, without any diſtinction of Perſons, or places.

His 34. Chapt. is a Spring tide of injuries which in ſmale ſhowers he povred out againſt me in every chapter of his book; to which my anſwer will be ſylence, and that patience to which Chriſtians are obliged by the example of him who being brought as a ſheep to the ſlaughter, was dumb before his ſhearers and opened not his mouth. He flatters himſelf with the opinion of ſom Divins of his Church, who ſay, the Vows he made of Povertie, Obedience, and Chaſtitie in the Roman Church, nor the Precepts of that Church do not oblige him now, ſince he is a Proteſtant; and the ſame he ſaies pag. 181. againſt J. E. in his firſt part againſt N.N. and for this he gives two reaſons; firſt he ſaies, he has demonſtrated evidently he cannot keep thoſe Vows and Precepts of the Church of Rome, without infringing them of God, becauſe they are oppoſit: But in the firſt Chapter of this Treatiſe I have ſhewen this to be fals; for there is no Divin Precept commanding vs to have a good Pariſh to have Rents,

honors and dignities : ſince therefore you have made a ſolemn vow of having no Rents, no Honors, no Pariſh, but to liue in pouertie ; how can you ſay this vow does not oblige you ? with what Diuin precept is the complyance of this vow inconſiſtent ? allow the Precept of the Church of hearing Maſs does not oblige you, becauſe in it we adore the Hoſt; allow alſo your vow of Chaſtitie, is not conſiſtent with S. Paul's counſel of marrying, rather than to burn ; becauſe you may find by experience you cannot contain; but againſt what Divin precept or counſel is it, to ſay your Divin Office, *Matins* and *Laudes* euery day ? why do not you obey this Precept of the Church ? with what Divin Precept is the faſt of lent, the faſt of fridaies and Saturdaies inconſiſtent ? why do not you obſerve theſe Precepts of the Church ? particularly that your own Proteſtant Common Prayer book exhorts you to theſe faſts.

His ſecond reaſon, becauſe thoſe vows he made, and his Obedience to thoſe Precepts, were grounded vpon a blind Obedience to the Pope of Rome,

including a disobedience to Gods laws; and consequently the vows are Null: But I have shewen his vows, and those Precepts include no disobedience to God's law: and I will shew, tho he made those vows vnder the Pope, yet now, forsaking the Pope, he must stick to the vows: for I ask you Dr, are not you still bound to the Duties of a Priest (whateuer that duty be) tho it be vnder the Popes Obedience you receiued your Priest hood? are not you, I say, still a Priest? can you disown your caracter, because you receiued it vnder the Pope? and why can you disown your other obligations contracted vnder the Pope; if you cannot show they are inconsistent with Gods Laws? you were vnder the Obedience of the Pope, it's true, when you made a vow of Pouertie, Chastitie and Obedience; but it's not the Pope commanded you to make them; it was a free voluntarie act of your own, and therefore whether you liue vnder the Popes Obedience or not, you remain still obliged, as you remain still a Priest and with the obligations of a Priest.

Remember that Passage of *Ananias*

and *Saphira* Act. 5. they ſold their lands, they ſacrificed the price of it at the Apoſtles feet to God ; it was by no Command of S. Peter ; it was a voluntarie free action of their own ; this oblation (whether it vas a vow of pouertie or not) obliged them in conſcience , and they tranſgreſſed againſt the holy Ghoſt, by detaining a part of that which they had ſacrific'd to God : whether Peter, vnder whom they liued when they made this oblation , was *Pope* or not ; *ſupream head* or not of the Church ; the ſacrifice and oblation they made, obliged them in conſcience ; for it was a voluntarie free action of their own ; therefore they ſinn'd in tranſgreſſing againſt it : this caſe is as like yours, as you can paint one : whether the Pope, under whom you liued , when you made a ſolemn vow of pouertie, of chaſtitie and obedience , a ſolemn vow of neuer admitting any dignitie or honor in the Church ; whether I ſay , the Pope was ſupream head of the Church or not ; that excuſes you not ; you made that ſacrifice of your ſelf to God , you made thoſe vows , not by conſtraint or command of the Pope ; it was

your own voluntarie free action ; it obliges you ſtill, let the Pope be what he will : liſten now Dr to S. Gregorie l. 1. Epiſtol. 33. writing to *Venantius* an Apoſtat, who forſook his Convent and religious life to become Chancellor of Italie : *Ananias pecunias Deo vouerat, quas poſt, diabolica fraude victus, ſubſtraxit ; ſed qua morte mulctatus eſt, ſcis ; ſi ergo ille mortis periculo dignus fuit, qui eos quos dederat nummos Deo abſtulit ; conſidera quanto periculo in divino judicio dignus eris, qui non nummos, ſed teipſum Deo omnipotenti, cui ſub Monachali habitu te devoveras ſubſtraxiſti ? conſidera judicium Dei, quid mereatur, qui ſemetipſum Deo vovit, continuoque mundi deſideriis irretitus, mentitus eſt quod vovit. Ananias ſacrific'd his monie to God, which he afterward, ouercom by Satans inſtigation, ſtole from God ; but you know with what death he was puniſhed ; and if he, who took from God the monies he ſacrificed vnto him, deſerved ſuch a death, in what a dangerous condition will you be before the tribunal of God ; who haſt withdrawen from God, not your monies, but yourſelf, after you had conſecrated yourſelf vnto him in a Monaſtical life ? conſider Gods judgment : what he deſerves, who has conſecrated himſelf to God,*

and enſnared by worldly deſires, his diſa-vowed what he his vowed. Change but *Sall* for *Venantius* and *Chancellor of Italie*, for *Parſon of Swords*; and S. Gregories words come pat to our Dr.

THE CONCLVSION.

DOctor had you begun the carrier you are now in, fiftie years agon, it would be ſtill criminal in you, but leſs admired by the world; but now in your crawling years, to abandon yourſelf to your liberty, when you cannot enjoy it but for ſo ſhort a time; to indulge your paſſiõs in the *Autumn* of your daies, which you curb'd in the *Spring* of your life; to proſtitute yourſelf to tranſitorie pleaſures, when you ſtand with one foot in the grave, at the brim of eternitie; to faune at the world in ſuch an age, when men are deſpiſed by the world; neuer could Satan have beguiled you in a worſe time, nor you have changed your religion to leſs of worldlie advantage. Had you intended in this change of Religion to better your

life and ſecure your ſaluation, as you pretend to perſwade vs, you might anſwer, that they who came to the Vyneyard at the eleaventh houre, were as well rewarded, as they who entred at the third houre; but Alas? you have too much of reaſon for to believe you could better yourſelf; and too much of judgment for to think any man can believe this was your aim: I appeale to the know ledge of any impartial man; if there be any among you of leſs edification, of leſs conſcience and honor, than thoſe, who of Prieſts and Fryars, become Proteſtants; and if they become not more debauch and riotous libertins, than formerly they were. What man of them can you produce, who by his exchange of religion became more devout, more reformed in his life, and more given to Meditations, prayers, and other religious exerciſes, and auſterities of life than before? and you will tell vs, it's to reform your life, and ſecure your ſalvation you have quitted your religious Order, and become a Proteſtant?

You exhort me to conſider the miſerable condition wee are in, dazl'd with

the ſplendor of the *Roman Grandeur, and baited with the ſtrong allurements of it, deceiving the world with colours of Sanctity, when ambition and avarice is the Primum Mobile of all our actions, and the Soule which animates all our motions.* I pray Sr, what ſhare of this *Grandeur* and *worldly allurements* had you, when you were of your former Profeſſion? or have the Carthuſians, Capuchins, and other religious orders of both ſexes now? was it to encreaſe the worldly Pomp of the Italian court; was it ambition or avarice that moued ſo many Noble men and women of rich eſtates, to quit their plentifull life, their honors and dignities, their numerous retinue of Servants, ſacrific'd all at the feet of Chriſt's Croſs, and conſecrated themſelves to a religious Cell, to a life of continual mortification, of Diſciplins, hair-cloths, faſting, aſſiduous duties of a Quyre, and begging their food from doore to doore? had they left their own eſtates and gon to Rome to be Popes or Cardinals, you might ſuſpect the puritie of their intentions; but to ſay it was Ambition, Avarice, and allurements of worldly pleaſures car-

ried them to be Carthuſians, Capuchins, Nuns, &c. is to make them worſe than mad men: I pray was it *ambition* that moved you when you made a vow neuer to pretend or accept any Dignitie? or may not wee judge it was *ambition* moved you to infringe that vow, and pretend and have the Dignity of Dean of S. Patrick's Church (if you be Dean, as they ſay) was it avarice that moved you, when you made a ſolemn vow of pouertie, and never to have any Rents or revenues? or was it not avarice that moved you to break this vow, and accept a good Pariſh and rents as they ſay you have?

I pray tell ingenuouſly, what worldly allurements had you to continue in the Profeſſion you were of for ſo many years in Ireland? you may ſay perhaps, you had great allurements in ſpain to be of that profeſſion; the great credit, and impolyments of honor, you ſay you had, might have been an allurement vnto you; but what allurements had you for to continue in that profeſſion in Ireland for ſo many years? your allurements was pouertie, having no other ſubſiſtance but the charitie

and alms of the people ; no other exercise of your great (as you imagined) Talents , but to preach somtimes and teach the Catechism , commonly to poore people ; wandring vp and down to friends houses , to pick vp a liuelyhood; somtimes wellcom , and somtimes not ; to fare at other mens tables , somtimes ill , and somtimes well ; somtimes decently clad , and somtimes your pouertie not affording you to be so: your allurements besids this , was to say your Breviary dayly for about an hours time ; an hours meditation or mental prayer euery morning ; besids other devotions which you were obliged by your Rules to perform ; to fast in Lent, Fridaies and Saturdaies , and glad to hit somtimes on bread and milk or butter ; other corporal austerities , if you satisfied your dutie ; continual feare of imprisonment or banishment ; an abnegation of your own Will to the conduct of your Superiors command against your inclinations ; these were the allurements you had to be of that Religion ; see whether ambition or avarice could have a share in the choice of such a life and Religion : you tell me

you will never again return to that Religion; that you will continue in Protestancy; and truly if nothing but Ambition, Avarice and worldly allurements gouern you actions, your are far better where you are, and will do very ill to return where you were; the allurements are strong for your continuance in Protestancie; you have a good Parish with good rents, and Judas betrayed his Master for a smaler interest; insteed of milk and eggs on fasting dayes, you have a good peece of beef and better cheer, and are not beholding to your neighbours, (if you please) for you may have a table of your own; you have neither Breviary, nor beads nor meditation nor Mass to trouble your rest, but may sleep eat and drink at will and pleasure, and insteed of an auditorie of poore people, you can preach in Christ Church, and have access to great ones: these indeed are strong (but earthly) allurements to keep you in Protestancy, and bid a figg for Popery.

But I beseech you once more, good Dr, reflect if this be the life you are obliged by your Vows to lead? con-

ſider if by your three ſolemn Vows, of pouertie, you have not ſacrificed your riches to God, proteſting you would neuer have any; if by your vow of Obedience you have not ſacrific'd your Will to God, giving it wholy to the conduct of your Superior; if by the Vow of Chaſtitie you have not conſecrated your body to God denying it worldly pleaſures; and conſider, how your preſent life is a violation of all theſe three Vows; of pouertie by the Pariſh and rents you enioy and are diſpoſed to receive more if you can get it; of Obedience, by ſubſtracting your ſelf from your Superiors conduct, and living at your will; of Chaſtitie, if not by marrying, by holding marriage is lawfull for you: and after theſe Conſiderations, liſten to S. Baſil. in Regul. Interrog. 14. *Si poſtquam intra reliquorum Fratrum Societatem admiſſus eſt, factam à ſe jam profeſſionem reſciderit, is perinde aſpici debet, vt qui in Deum peccaverit, cui ſolemni ſe voto obligavit: etenim qui ſemel ſeipſum Deo devouit; is, ſi ad aliud vitæ genus tranſierit, ſacrilegij ſe crimine obſtrinxit, vtpote qui ſeipſum Deo, cui ſe conſecraverat ſubterfuratus eſt.* He who after being

received into the communitie of the reſt of the Brethren, ſhall reſcind the profeſſion he has made, is to be looked vpon as a tranſgreſſor againſt God, to whom he has obliged himſelf by Vow: for he who has conſecrated himſelf to God, if after, he ſhould paſſ into an other Kind of life; he is guiltie of ſacriledge, as having ſtoln from God, what he had conſecrated vnto him. O! Dr ſhould not your heart tremble at theſe words? you have reſcinded the profeſſion you made; you have conſecrated your ſelf to God, and have forſaken that, and paſt to an other kind of life; that Pariſh, thoſe Rents, that libertie, that pleaſure you enioy are ſtolen, and robb'd from God to whom you conſecrated them by ſolemn Vows; reſtore them again o Doctor returning to that pouertie, Obedience and Chaſtitie which you Vowed; if, as a fraile man, you fell; arriſe as a Chriſtian, *Humanum eſt cadere, Chriſtianum reſipiſcere, Diabolicum perſeverare*; Hell was not created for ſin if repented, but for obſtinacy in our tranſgreſſion; nor was Heaven created for the innocent only; but for the penitent ſinner.

Lift vp your eyes to the top of a

Pillar thirtie foot heigh ; there you ſhall ſee that Miracle of Chriſtian auſteritie *Simon Stellites* , faſting without any manner of food 28 Lents in imitation of Chriſt ; having no ſhelter againſt the ſtorms of Winter , or heat of Summer, but his conſtancy ; his body couered with a rude haire-cloth , his bed but the bare top of the Pillar , and his fleſh battered dayly with diſciplins to bloodſhed : look vpon Antonie the Abbot , ſhut vp in a caue for the ſpace of twentie years ; feeding on bread and water ; ſleeping on the bare ground ; clad with beaſt's Skins , and ſearching all occaſions of mortifieing his fleſh : Conſider S. Benedict and S. Francis , the one wallowing himſelf in thornie buſhes , the other in heapes of ſnow for to ouercom impure thoughts , which aſſaulted them : look on S. Francis Xaverius in the hoſpital , waſhing the Vlcers and Soares of the Sick , and drinking the water wherwith he had waſhed them ; to check the loathſomneſs which his body conceiued at that filthred. Conſider S. Louis Gonzaga Surrounded in Court with many allurements of impuritie ; and for to pre-

ſerve his ſoule vnſpotted ; how he girded his ſydes with wheels of ſpurs to curb his fleſh ; To be brief look into the Convents of both Sexes, their Cells ring with the *Echo* of their diſciplins ; their beds afford more pain than eaſe to their tyred bodies ; their food ſerves for to liue , to ſuffer more ; their life is a continued diſtribution of the day into ſeueral houres of ſpiritual exerciſes : is it Avarice , is it Ambition , is it allurements of worldlie pleaſures , is it for to encreaſe the Roman ſplendor and Grandeur think you that men liue ſo in the Catholic Religion ; as if it had been the *Italian Policy* that preſcribed that ſort of life , and not Jeſus Chriſt: is not this retirement from the world ; this abdication of wordlie Pomp and vanitie ; this humiliation and renunciation of honors , eſtates and riches ; this auſteritie of life , and mortification of our paſſions recommended to vs in the Ghoſpell, preached by S. Paul , practis'd by David , the great Baptiſt , the Apoſtles and the eminent Saints of Chriſtianity ?

Reade what the Ghoſpel relates of the courſe fare, of the groſſe attyre , of the great

great retirement of S. John Baptiſt; *Omni naturæ neceſſitate ſuperata* (ſaies Chryſoſt. in cap. 11. Math. Hom. 38.) *mirabile quoddam iter peregit: ſemper in Hymnis, ſemper in orationibus fuit; nulli hominum, antequam ad Baptizandum accederet, ſed ſoli Deo ſua ſemper offerebat colloquia: non lacte nutritus: non lecto ſuſceptus, non tecto, non alia re humana vſus eſt.* *Having ouercom all the want and exigencies of Nature, he walked in a moſt admirable courſe of life: he lived alwaies in Hymns and prayers* (is not this like the Quyres of our Churchs and religious orders)? *he had no converſation with men, but all with God alone,* (is not this the religious retirement of our Monks and Nuns?) *He did not feed on Milk* (*nor wine or ſtrong liquor, but wild Honnie and Locuſts*) *nor did he ſleep on a bed, nor dwelled vnder any roof, nor did he vſe, what men commonly vſe.* (Is not this the auſteritie of life, the mortifications and pennances of our Church, which you call deſperat and indiſcreet auſterities deſtructive to Body and Soule?) Read the Haire-cloths of David, his eating of aſhes with his bread, his faſting, his ryſing at midnight to ſing pſalms, and

the like Auſterities commended by Scripture in ſeveral others ; and let the Impartial Reader judge , if the Tenor of life profeſſed by our Religious Orders , if the corporal mortifications and auſterities , of Diſciplins , of haire-cloths , of our Quyres , of ſleeping on the bare ground , of courſe attires , of poore and ſcant fare , practiſed frequently in our Church by all ages and ſexes , be not more conformable to what Scripture praiſes , to what Chriſt and his Apoſtles recommended , to what the Saints of the new and old Teſtament practis'd ; than the Tenor of life, Doctrin , and practice of the Proteſtant Church.

Summon now your reaſon Dr , and aſk your own conſcience , if you be not guiltie of as many ſins and imperfections , as thoſe Saints ; and conclude if they did ſo much to expiat their ſins , what you ought to do ? aſk if you be not as prone to temptations , and as weake to reſiſt them as they were ; and if they, to prevent temptations, did ſo much ; how com you to forſake that profeſſion wherin you might and were obliged to imitat them ? aſk , if you

have a greater claim to heaven, than they had? and reſolve for to purchaſe heaven, to do more, and return to your devoir; ſince that they, for to purchaſe it have don ſo much? or conclude, that Chriſt, when he ſaid the kingdom of heaven ſuffers force, and the violent ſhall carrie it, he ſpoke to them, and not to you: their lot is eternal conſolation in the other life, becauſe heer they mourned and wept in pennance: their lot is everlaſting fullſomneſs, becauſe heer they ſuffered hunger and thirſt: their Soules are now in a height of glorie, becauſe their Bodies were heer in the depth of affliction; We may parallell the Body and Soule to two ſcales; the one ſcale will never ryſe, if the other does not fall; if this mounts, the other will ſink: that the ſoule may riſe, the Body muſt fall; if the Body be kept high, the ſoule will fall low; witneſs the ſoule of the Rich Glutton burning in the depth of hell; *epulabatur quotidie ſplendide*; his body was kept high; the ſequele was, *ſepultus eſt in inferno*: his ſoule was buried in hell: ſee Dr in what degree your body was kept, by the ſtate of religious life

you profeſſed; you forſooke that ſtate; you have raiſed your Body to a great hight; feare, leaſt it may be ſaid of you ſom day, *ſepultus eſt in inferno.*

For Man's life is often termed in holy Writ, a *Dream*; and it is remarkable, that after a merry pleaſant dream, we awake with ſorrow and ſadneſs; but after a heavy ſad dream we awake with ioy and content: *ſatius eſt amara ſomniare quam dulcia, ſaies Petrarchus, amari enim ſomnij exitus dulcis eſt, & dulcis amarus. Its better have a ſad bitter dream, than a ſweet pleaſant one; becauſe the ſequele of a ſweet dream is bitter; of a bitter one, is ſweetneſs*: You dream that your Spouſe is treacherouſly ſnatcht out of your bed, and murthered before your face; you cry out, *Murther*; you awake, but with ioy, that all was but a dream; you dream you have hit on a great purſe of Gold for to relieve your wants; you rejoyce; you awake, but with ſorrow, that your content was but a dream: Joſeph dreamed the Sun, Moon, and Stars, proſtrated at his feet, did adore him; he awakes from this dreamed felicity, and meets a check from his Father, perſecution from his brethren, ſlavery

from the Madianits, and impriſonment from Putiphar; what a heape of ſorrow followed his pleaſant dream. Our life is but a dream, Dr, from which wee will awake in the other world by death; we will awak to ſorrow or content, according the qualitie of our dream: ſee what life you have forſaken, which by your profeſſion you ought to have lead; a life of religious povertie, living by charitie and alms, and often wanting; of religious Obedience and Chaſtitie; a life of pennance and auſteritie, of faſting, prayers, perſecutions, afflictions, this was a ſad dream from which, if you had continued it, you might have expected to awake in the other life with ioy: ſee what life you lead in the Proteſtant Church? it's a merry pleaſant dream, plenty of mony; liberty without any check, good attire, well lodged, no obligation of faſting, of other mortifications, of a Breviary; a iouial dream; but feare that you may awake in the other life to eternal grief and ſorrow, and you may ſay with the Debauched mentioned Sap. 5 *What has the pride of our life auailed vs, or the abundance of our riches profited vs*; do not

hazard eternitie for a time; and a real felicitie for a dreamed happineſs.

FINIS.

ERRATA CORRIGENDA.

PAg. 4. lin. 6. appeur. Read appear. lin. 7. wonds. R. words. p. 6. l. 19. Sacrements. R. Sacraments. p. 8. l. 17. Ordinatioe. R. Ordination. l. 19. Nags-ead. R. Nags-head. p. 9. l. 10. pereiving. R. perceiving l. 11. Portie. R. Partie. p. 13. l. 14. outragions. R. outragious. l. 21. iu. R. in. p. 15. l. 4. Sacrements. R. Sacraments. p. 21. l. 23. vt. R. vs. p. 22. l. 4. ſnch. R. ſuch. l. 9. obvions. R. obvious. p. 23. l. 6. ad. R. and. l. 23 tho. R. the p. 26. l. 10. leymen. R. laymen. p. 27. l. 6. thoſes. R. thoſe. p. 30. l. 1. indged. R. judged. l. 2. perfectedly. R. perfectly. p. 38. l. 25. firgurative. R. figurative. p. 50. l. 9. ſpalms. R. pſalms. p. 55. l. 26. abſoluty. R. abſolutly. p. 69 l. 8. Winſmeſter. R. Weſtminſter. p 70. l. 8. Anſtin R. Auſtin. p. 102. l. 5. out. R.

ERRATA.

our. l. 17. maiice. R. malice. p. 103. l. 13 obtinat. R. obſtinat. l. 14. Congrations. R. Congregations. l. 20. obieteuely. R. obiectiuely. p. 104. l. 5. patt. R. part. p. 105. l. 1. præcipui. R. præcipuis. p. 131 l. 1. bnginning. R beginning. p. 133. l. 2. chuch. R. church. l. 4. his. R. this p. 134. l. 7. lone R. loue. p. 160 l. 5. ground. R. grounded p. 245. l. 18. obcurely. R. obſcurely. p. 246. l. 27. ſpeakes. R. ſpeake. p. 266. l. 20. Trearíſe. R. Treatiſe. pag. 304. l. 26. our. R. out.